

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 124

EC 062 245

AUTHOR Stewart, Larry G., Ed.
TITLE Perspectives in Education of the Deaf.
INSTITUTION Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Rehabilitation Services Administration.
PUB DATE Mar 72
NOTE 90p.; Proceedings of National Forum V, Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf (Memphis, Tennessee, February 29-March 3, 1972)
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. (Stock Number 1760-00118, \$0.95)
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Aurally Handicapped; *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Conference Reports; Counseling; *Deaf; *Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; *Exceptional Child Education; Innovation; Language Development; National Organizations; Parent Role; School Role; Sensitivity Training; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Reported are proceedings of the fifth national forum (1972) of the Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf which had a registration of more than 500 parents, deaf adults and youth, and professionals. One of the purposes of the forum is stimulating new developments in education of the deaf. The keynote speech entitled "Love-In" addresses the need for a person to love and respect deaf children and self in order to help deaf children. Listed are responses by participants to 25 topics such as Summerhill, total communication, and parent education. "What is learning" is the focus of discussions in areas such as nonverbal communication, the school's role, parent education, and teacher education. The deaf person and learning is discussed in relation to learning to learn and developing sensitivity to issues and problems. Language and communication are examined in terms such as language input and output, and differentiation between language and communication. Listed are participants' comments on incidental learning, linguistic communities, and the role of deaf children's parents. Discussed are changing educational objectives, teacher training, counseling, educational systems, teaching methods, recent educational innovations, and student involvement. Listed are participants' statements on school administration, dormitory living, faculty and student committees, and continuing education. Reviewed are communication methods such as Ameslan and auditory training. Commented on are sex education, religious education, drugs, and higher education. Reported from the junior "rap-in" are views on topics such as communication, counselors, and parents. (MC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION OF THE DEAF

ED 093124

EC000015

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Social and Rehabilitation Service
Education Service Administration
Washington, D.C. 20045

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED—Title V of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefit of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

Annual Forum

An Annual Forum is sponsored by the Council each year in conjunction with the annual election meeting of the Board of Directors. Those attending the Forum have an opportunity to focus on topics of current and long range interest in the field of deafness, in order to explore courses of action by the Council or by individual member organizations. Participation in the Forum is open to invited professionals in the field as well as individual members of the affiliated organizations. The Annual Forum proceedings provide a developmental and specialized library on deafness:

- 1968—*New Horizons on Deafness* (Washington, D.C.)
- 1969—*The Deaf Man and the World* (New Orleans, La.)
- 1970—*Legal Rights of the Deaf* (Chicago, Ill.)
- 1971—*Medical Aspects of Deafness* (Atlantic City, N.J.)
- 1972—*Perspectives in the Education of the Deaf* (Memphis, Tenn.)

Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf

PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION OF THE DEAF



Proceedings of
National Forum V
Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf

Sponsored by
Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf
Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf
Gallaudet College
Model Secondary School for the Deaf
National Association of the Deaf

February 29–March 3, 1972
Memphis, Tennessee

Editor
Larry G. Stewart, Ed.D.

Associate Editors
Frank Bowe, M.A.
Glenn Lloyd, Ed.D.
Norman Tully, Ed.D.

This manual is the outgrowth of the Fifth National Forum sponsored by the Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf. The Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf is supported in part by a grant from the Division of Rehabilitation and Employability Research, Social and Rehabilitation Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Grant No. 14-P-55076/3-04)

Foreword

The Rehabilitation Services Administration is pleased to make available the report of the proceedings of the Fifth National Forum of the Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf, *Perspectives in Education of the Deaf*. It has followed with deep interest the impact of the annual forums, particularly their capability in generating constructive thinking on major areas of concern to deaf people and those who serve them.

An important trend seen in the forums is the increasingly effective leadership of professionals and lay persons who are deaf and the involvement of deaf youth, thereby furthering the goals for handicapped people in the vocational rehabilitation service. Equally important is the influx of disciplinarians from outside the area of deafness, thus providing opportunity for cross-exposure, new views, better answers to old questions.

We believe that this report will rekindle the spirit born at the forum for those who participated and light new ways for others who could not be there.

Corbett Reedy
Acting Commissioner

Editor's Preface

LARRY G. STEWART, Ed.D.
The University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

This report attempts to capture the essence of the Fifth National Forum of the Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf, "Perspectives in Education of the Deaf," held at the Rivermont Holiday Inn in Memphis, Tennessee on February 29-March 3, 1972.

Forum V was different from previous Forums in that no prepared talks were given, but rather, the majority of time was given to small group interaction and discussion. Accordingly, the responsibility for recording and reproducing the essence of the interaction that took place during the Forum fell upon the group facilitators, recorders, and interpreters, and finally, upon the editors. The magnitude and complexity of this task can best be appreciated by the fact that there were 200 small group discussion reports, covering ten major areas of concern, that were prepared by the recorders and synthesized by the editors. This report is the result.

The Memphis Forum was an outstanding meeting which gave parents, deaf adults and youths, and professionals an opportunity to express their thoughts and feelings concerning the education of the deaf yesterday, today, and tomorrow. While it was not possible to record all that was said, an attempt was made to select those portions of the group discussion reports which, in the editors' collective opinion, best capture the spirit of Forum V.

The editor wishes to express his appreciation for the fine support and assistance given to him by the Forum V Planning Committee chaired by Mr. Mervin Garretson, by COSD Executive Director Edward C. Carney and his staff, and by the group recorders who worked so hard to document the small group discussion contents. Much of the credit for this report must be given to the Associate Editors: Mr. Frank Bowe, New York University; Dr. Glenn Lloyd, New York University; and Dr. Norman Tully, Gallaudet College. As the person responsible for the final product, this editor assumes the responsibility for any errors or omissions in the report.

A note of appreciation is due the Social and Rehabilitation Service, the major funding resource for the COSD, which foresaw the opportunity for sharp focus on critical areas and issues of the day that a council could provide through forums. The acclaim accorded the 1972 forum and previous ones substantiates the confidence that the SRS has placed in COSD.

Contents

Foreword	iii
Editor's Preface	v
Inaugural Session	
President's Welcome	viii
Forum Rationale	ix
I. Keynote Address	
Love-In— <i>Dr. Albert E. Ross</i>	1
II. Positive Response	11
III. What is Learning?	20
IV. The Deaf Person and Learning	33
V. Language and Communication	38
VI. Incidental Learning, the Community, and the Home	42
VII. Educational Objectives, Teacher Training, and Counseling	47
VIII. Systems of Education, Teaching Techniques, Innovations, and Student Involvement	54
IX. Administration, Dormitory Living, Committees, and Continuing Education	58
X. Communication Methods	64
XI. Sex Education, Drugs, Religious Education, and Higher Education	67
XII. Jr. NAD Rap-In	71
XIII. Forum Summary	74
Appendices	
Appendix A—Forum V Planning Committee	77
Appendix B—Group Facilitators, Interpreters, and Recorders	78

Welcome

EMIL S. LADNER
President
Council of Organizations
Serving the Deaf

On behalf of the Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf, it is our great privilege and pleasure to welcome all of you to our Fifth Annual Forum here in the city of Memphis, in the state of Tennessee, this first day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy-two.

As you may have noticed from the program, this Forum is designed to be different! No formal speeches and discussions are scheduled, but rather there is to be a sharing of dreams, of ideas, of hopes, of gripes—by anyone and everyone.

Our theme is "Perspectives in Education of the Deaf" because each one of us views our world from different angles, distances, and perhaps traditions. We need to share one another's knowledge, experiences, innovations, or whatever we may have on our minds pertaining to the education of the deaf. In this way we hope to contribute something toward a better and brighter future in the education of the deaf.

We will begin with a "Love-in" which we hope will lead to a "Share-In", perhaps a few "Fight-Ins" and surely to a "Live-In."

To begin may we personally say "I love you all."

Forum Rationale

MERVIN D. GARRETSON

Chairman

COSD Fifth National FORUM

The most significant aspect of the COSD Forum may be reflected in its annual cross-disciplinary intermix. As in the ancient Roman Forum a setting is provided for communication among a wide spectrum of specialties. Participants may expect a wholesome sharing of experiences and beliefs, some insights into reality as perceived by the deaf person, and a seeking for meaningful goals and ideals as viewed by both the deaf and the hearing.

Important and implicit in the concept of this Forum is a dialogue free from the need to endorse or to recommend. We do not seek consensus but sensitivity.

This year's program departs from previous meetings in that no formal papers will be presented. All of us gathered here will be both speaker and audience. I believe that our composite togetherness represents the real expertise on deafness. However, for purposes of information and in-put, a Thursday morning smorgasbord of mini-presentations will replace group discussions. Opportunity is provided to attend a variety of mini-talks and demonstrations every half hour or so.

This week's theme revolves around education of the deaf as perceived from a distance—in perspective—as a totality of the learning experience. We will attempt to interrelate, to see the separate parts in gestalt rather than in their isolated separateness; to discern the different components of education in their true relationship or relative importance to each other.

To understand more specifically why we are here and where we hope to go we might consider as some of our objectives:

To raise questions about educational gerrymandering and jerry-building.

To question some elements of educational hypocrisy in the area of deafness.

To stimulate new developments and new dimensions in education.

To engender thinking and direction toward new goals which may become generative beyond this Forum.

To consider tomorrow against the backdrop of yesterday's experience.

To develop a greater sensitivity to all aspects of education of the deaf.

To depart from Memphis with increased awareness to other programs, to other viewpoints, to diverse methodologies and systems, and to consumer needs and views.

To provide and to receive information.

We are here for vital interaction, a fresh look and a new climate, to recognize that education of the deaf encompasses the whole environment over and beyond the classroom.

Hopefully we will depart Friday with a clearer picture of what the educated deaf child could and ought to be. With some hopes and dreams inspired by this shared experience, with both questions and answers, may we all take home much more than we have put in.

I. Keynote Address

ALBERT E. ROSS, Ph.D.
University of
Southern California

LOVE-IN

What I want you to do for this hour is take a trip with me, about what the meaning of love is to me and hopefully some kind of transaction can go on between us. I'd like to start out by saying just how I feel at this moment. I can't quite tell you how filled my heart is.

It's an extraordinary experience, because I want you to know that as of 1:45 yesterday afternoon I had absolutely zero contact or any kind of experience with any person who dealt with the problems of the deaf. I understand now why, for the first time, you enlightening people who arranged this program selected me because I came in, as John Locke said, with a "blank screen." That is, I came in with no preconceived notions and as such I could approach you people with an "open mind." In the few hours since the time I met Lou and Karen, I have just absorbed a great deal. First of all I have absorbed all that Lou told me because he and I sat in the airplane for three hours with Karen and we had our own "love-in" on the airplane. There was this kind of non-verbal communication—e.g., an immediate kind of a process, and I'd like to share those kinds of feelings. Let me get more seriously to talking about a concept which I would call "Love as the key to both turning, tuning in and dropping in."

I want to talk about my own feelings for a moment. Everything that has happened to this point has touched me very deeply. There is something about the whole aura of communication among you people that really makes this so significant today. Those of us in the hearing world who have never touched a deaf person (1) take ourselves for granted, and (2) are so bombarded by all kinds of junk that we don't ever really get inside of our being. The real meaning of education comes from the Latin word "educare" which means to

lead out from, from inside to the outside. Everything that you do in your "hand speech" is leading you from inside to the outside, which is the real basic part of education.

The other thing that I have to talk about is the concept of love, what I mean by love, and how simple it is to love not only your loved ones, but specifically what a beautiful process that you and I are fortunate in using love in being teachers. Now, I have been many things throughout my life, but the one consistent theme throughout my life, both as a goal and a process, is that of teacher. I am a teacher foremost. I am a teacher when I have done consulting or therapy, and I am most of all a teacher when I am teaching. Right now I believe that that is what is going on. What I mean by teaching is that process that is only characterized by human beings—of the capacity of one human being to communicate to another human being. To say, "Hey! I know you as a human being exist." And I exist. And in that magical moment of our human interaction something very significant happens to both of us. Teaching can never be "I am the expert" and "you are the insignificant doldrum kind of person." One of the things that I am so strongly opposed to is the entire psychiatric field that trained me with the concept that in psychiatry, there are two people—the doctor who is very healthy, and the patient who is very sick, and never the twain shall meet. In teaching, in religion, in human relationships where the principle of love is the controlling force, I as a teacher, and you as a human being, are both human beings. I have never been in an experience where I couldn't say that if that person learns then I must learn too. I must be a learner in every experience that I've had, and I believe for me these past 16 hours have been an extraordinary learning experience. I feel that I am going away so much richer already and the morning has just started!

Let me get into why I feel loving is so significant, and what I mean by loving. Love, to me, is that process by which I get to know you, and you get to know me. If I may for a moment, let me get away from teaching and the deaf and just talk about people, especially about men and women in love. I think you will all enjoy this. I think that the word love is one of the most misused, misunderstood words in the English language. And people say there is no such thing as love because love means different things to different people. OK. But I, in my 50 years of living and all the years of being a teacher and a therapist, really have come to grips with the fact that there are absolutely certain ingredients that are part of the loving process, that are indispensable.

In the first place, most significantly there can never be love unless both of the lovers feel better about themselves as part of the loving process. I can love you like Cyrano De Bergerac loved Roxanne. (Now that was love!) He was burning with unrequited love. He was so miserable, and I'm sure in your young lives, or not so young lives, you have all had someone who loves you but treats you like dirt, and you are awfully miserable, but you say, "I love him!" But you're not loving him, you're just suffering. Love really doesn't mean "How much can I take from this SOB," rather how much do you really feel about me—not the me that you have imagined, but the me that I am. How much do I know about you? Not the you that I think you are, not the you that I hope you are, but the you that you really are and will become. That is what love is all about.

Love is the connection from the past to the present to the future. Which means that I say, "Hey, I don't always love you because of this moment, I don't always love you because you make me feel groovy, I don't always love you just because when we make love it's a great thing, but rather I am loving a human being who is in process, who is growing, evolving, who is becoming and it's a terribly exciting thing watching human beings in love evolve."

And of course the great exciting thing is when your lover feels the same way about you. That really is a mutual kind of thing and I call it (I've just come up with the word recently in a book that I'm finishing), soul laving, your soul feels laved—washed. Just as if a beautiful blue ocean has touched it, because of the loving process. I feel that that kind of loving process that happens in a direct way between one man and one woman can apply in a maximum of relations as well. Let me tell you a little bit about me in this connection. I suppose that up to about eight years ago I had a very staid tradition about the process of monogamy, and I always thought that if I wanted or loved any other woman other than my wife, whom I love very much, that there was something goofy about me. You can't love, feel, touch, sense, any other person because somehow or other it should be restricted. About eight years ago I came to the realization that when I am loving, in my work as teacher or therapist, I say, "Of course I love you!" Now that doesn't mean, "Oh my God, I can't wait until I go to bed with you." But it means, "I love, you, I touch you, I feel you, I know you, I understand you, I empathize with you." And when it is mutual it is an enhancing process. I had a magnificent day a few weeks ago in which I had 12 straight hours with 12 different women and girls (students and patients), and I came home that night at 11:30, and my lovely wife was there waiting and I made love to her like I never did before. What I am talking about is the accumulative effect of the loving process. One of the things I teach and I hope you understand, is that love is like a gas, it expands

with use and contracts with disuse. And that's part of the whole process.

Now how does this get involved with teaching? Or any kind of human relation? You see, I think what happens to all of us, we are so concerned with being *loved*, being like everybody else, we are in fact controlled by what I call external motivation—that is, I am going to behave according to the way you expect me. I am going to behave according to the way I think you will like me best. If I'm a good boy, if I do what you tell me, if I never rock the boat, if I never challenge you, if I always agree with you, if I'm always doing your thing, *you will love me*. Now maybe I don't think I'm such a good guy after all, and I need your love. So I'm going to behave according to the way you want me to. That's how many children are raised and it takes years, and hard work, to try and get out of the shackles of this kind of imprisonment. Because it is really imprisonment. And it's especially an imprisonment if you have love parents, because you might say, "How can I be me, the stubbornness that is me when my parents really know what is best for me. I better not be able to do what I was really meant to do."

But sooner or later, if you just open up your mind, somewhere along the line some of you must feel, as Shakespeare said, "Hey, something is rotten in the state of Denmark." Because I am not really getting to deal with the me that is me. I am not being able to do something that I am comfortable with, because I am so darned concerned with what my parents might think, or my boss, my teacher, my government, my president, or whoever that might be. And it's very difficult to get to what is going on with me.

What really goes on in the heads of the children you teach? How do we reach them? What does go on? How much do we know or care? I'm submitting that only in a loving relationship, where love becomes the number one priority of your concepts, when you say "Hey, I am primarily concerned with the loving process to this child, to this other human being," then you begin to get that tremendous kind of feeling of excitement, and understanding and communication of what this separate human being is, and more importantly, you get to begin to know each time what that human being is that *you are*.

Many of us have been raised to be devoted always to the other. And that's a lovely life, and I wouldn't put that aside, but I pay the price when that devotion to the other goes beyond the devotion and the necessary being of my soul, so that I can't grow and even the other suffers. Now let me clarify this. I want to be sure you understand this. That doesn't mean that I'm selfish. I am saying that I just can't say "Hey, I'm only doing something for you because I am altruistic." That's a lot of baloney. There is nothing that a

human being does that doesn't carry with it a motivational structure from inside. Everyone responds to something from within them, something that is inside them. When Albert Schweitzer worked with lepers, he didn't do this because he said, "Ah, I have to devote my soul." Albert Schweitzer was 100% committed to that process. That fulfilled him. That gave him the meaning of love. When anyone is saying, "I want to teach, I want to reach, I want to touch, I want to feel," you may think that they are saying, "I really want to only know the other." But what they are truly saying is, "By my knowing others I begin to know myself." Most of our feelings are unconsciously based, and the glory of being a human being is as you evolve and grow these feelings emerge and you gradually discover who you are. By releasing your creativity, by coming out from your inside, by relating with another human being, by touching another human being, you touch another part of you. And that is one of the grooviest kinds of experiences to have.

I'd like to tell you now how I felt in coming here. Lou Fant, in a kidding way said yesterday, "You're going to be a stranger in a strange land." This reminded me of the book *Stranger in a Strange Land*, by Robert Heinlein. I recommend the book. It's extraordinary. And it talks more specifically and more beautifully as a novel to the few remarks I have to say. The concept that Lou was referring to, the concept that I was feeling, was really the outsider looking in. And I'm sure I have the sensitivity to the problem of people who have been cut off from certain kinds of processes. That is the whole barrier of communication between the deaf and the hearing world. I felt that last night. And I really didn't feel bad about it. I really felt excited about it. The reason I felt excited about it was that I began to know, even in the tiniest way—I don't pretend to say that that can be full understanding—but at least I got a fragment of the feeling of what it might feel like if I were beyond the realm of communication. In certain instances, when I was with Lou, I definitely felt out of it. This lasted only a little while, because I immediately appreciated that you people have discovered a principle of communication that many of us in the hearing world have yet to learn.

There's a whole movement out there, in the hearing world, called the Growth Potential Movement. It's a process by which human beings must go to a special place 50 miles away from the city where they can learn to hug each other, feel each other, touch each other, sense each other, see each other, be each other, hear each other. Because they never learned how to relate. They never learned how to look into a person's eyes and say, "Where are you coming from?" Two people can meet and they say, "Hello, I'm George, you're Harry." Harry's a psychologist, George is a policeman. "Oh, I know you then." But what does that tell you about

the man? That doesn't tell you a thing. Because you don't know who Harry is. Is Harry like all psychologists? I resent when anyone says, "Oh, you're a psychologist, that means. . . ." I've got you boxed. "Oh, you're a teacher of the deaf," I've got you pegged. "Oh, you're a lawyer, you're black, you're from Chicago, I've got your number." That's what people do. It's a cop-out. If I know your label then I don't have to think, I don't have to use my feelings. All I have to say is, "Hey, that's Joe, he's a lawyer," or "That's Fred, he's Roman Catholic." If someone different comes along we say, "He is different, therefore we must not like him," or "He is different, therefore we must be afraid of him." But we are really saying, "If I don't know who I am and you are different, I have a good cop-out to say, anything I don't like about me I put on you." So, if you're black, I take my blackness and put it on you. If I'm envious of the Jew, I say, I don't like that in me, so I put it on you. So if you're deaf or hard of hearing, I say, hey, I can't communicate with you, I put it on you. And what I sense in watching you people interacting, whether you realize it or not, you break that barrier.

Then I flashed for the first time the real meaning of *Stranger in a Strange Land*. You see, I was a stranger for about a minute and one-half really. As soon as you begin to deal with a stranger he is no longer a stranger. (That's a heavy one, we'll have to think about that one.) *Stranger in a Strange Land* is the most beautiful description of love. It is the story about a guy who was born up in Mars, from brilliant parents, and comes down to earth. It's about his adjustment to life in America. He meets a cool guy, about my age, who has four gorgeous girls that he makes love to. The man from Mars kisses one of the girls and she passes out. She says, "My God, there was nothing like that in my life!" Now guys kiss girls for a lot of reasons, but Michael (the man from Mars) kissed this girl, and when he did he was wholly concentrating on this girl in that existential moment, that moment in the here and now as if no other moment existed. She said "It was as if I were kissed by eternity." What I'm saying is that that kind of concentration, that kind of perception, that kind of total giving and receiving that can happen between a man and a woman, can happen with any human being. That's the kind of thing that says, "Hey, I love you and I love me. My love for you makes me love me better. And at the same time, I know that by my loving you, you feel better about you." The extraordinariness of this is the mutuality. It has got to be mutual. There is no such concept of love unless it is mutual. I cannot love you more than you love me, you cannot love me more than I love you. The type of concentration, the type of real interest in the other, the type of nonverbal communication is much more characteristic of the people in this audience than in the great majority of the

hearing world. And I feel we can learn a great deal about this process from you.

I'd just like for a few minutes to have you go on a trip with me which I call "The love trip for growth." From the time you're born until you die, you ask of yourself some questions. The first question you ask is "Am I?" By that I mean, are you at a separate existence from that nice comfortable womb? One of the ways you find out who you are is by your mother giving you love. The mother doesn't have to go to a psychologist's class to find that out. The mother says, I love you. But not just because you are an extension of me, not because you came out of my womb, but I love that being, that separate being that each of us is. That's what mother-love is about. If you've got that kind of "mother feeling" that's you, because then you can go on to the next question.

The next question is "Who Am I?" Because you know you are a separate person now. Little boys and girls when they are three years old, trying to discover who they are, sometimes experiment. And really they are not dirty. They're not really dirty pigs when the little boy takes the little girl's pants off and says what have you got? What have I got? They are only trying to find out, "Hey, are you the same as me?" And they are not! A lot of parents get uptight and say, "Oh my God, my dirty two-year-old!" Anyway, when you say "Who Am I?" that's a fundamental question and this is also a question of minority identification. Who am I? What group am I in? Do people make a distinction? Who am I?

That question is resolved by your knowing who your parents were. The greater degree of comfort that you feel your parents had, the greater degree of feeling you have about yourself. One of the things that touched me so deeply about my contact with the gentleman on the left (Lou Fant), is that it was obvious from the moment he opened his mouth that he had magnificent, loving parents. Most people who come to see me feel that they don't have loving parents. When I sit in a plane for 3½ hours with a beautiful human being who says, "Hey, my mother and father were deaf and they are the most beautiful people I have ever known," he didn't even have to tell me. I said, "Lou, it's obvious, it's so basic." He said, "What?" I said, "Your mother and father love you, and you love them." That's where it is! That's beautiful! All of us, no matter who we are, if we come out and say, "I love you, and my love is stronger than any damn thing that has ever happened to you," then the other can turn around and say, "God, there is a human being who really loves me." Now if loving parents present that kind of identification process, you have a really damn good basis to know "Who am I?" I am so and so and I am damn proud of it!

The third level is, what I call the "Am I loved?" stage. OK, you

know you exist. You know who you are. You are now growing up. You are now in that lovely time, in school. Another digression—I feel I know a lot about women, in fact my whole field is women and girls. But one thing I didn't understand until right now is girls' relations to girls, especially in that puberty period. I have a fourteen year old daughter and am I finding out about this phase! Now one of the things that happens in the "Am I Loved" stage is that now you find out that "mommy and daddy love me" and "I love me" but what about the outside world? So at the adolescent period the crucial point is, "Can I be acceptable by society?" How difficult it must be for a child, in Jr. High School, with all the different cliques, who hasn't been identified. He is so desperately looking for acceptance by his peers, and he doesn't get it. So he's constantly struggling with the question, "Am I loved?" He needs that constant reassurance that he is loved. If he doesn't get that reassurance he may try to get it wherever he may go. He may be motivated throughout his life to be reassured that **he is loved**.

The next phase is "OK, I'm loved, but don't you dare rock the boat." This happens in many marriages. In the wedding ceremony, aside from the other things going on, there is an unconscious thing happening, too. It goes like this: "I solemnly swear, that to the best of my ability, with all the being that I have, not to change, provided that you don't change also." When people make this unconscious contract with each other, they really are keeping the partner from growing for fear that they would have to grow also. Thousands of couples are caught up in this dilemma—many partners to this contract don't emancipate themselves for fear that they would be violating those terms. That is, they say, if I change I better keep quiet—because then he may have to, too. Or, I hope he doesn't change because then I will have to, too.

The last stage that we are all striving for, is "I am loved. I am loved so much that I can be my unique self, and therefore, I am able to love." I am saying that you really can't love until you have received love. But that also, the receiving of love, is not sufficient for the loving process. That once I can get over the idea of getting or receiving love, I can get onto the business of attaining what I feel is the most satisfying needs of a human, the need of loving. But in order to do this I have to feel that I want to—that this is my need—that I want to love, I want to live, and that I don't have to live for somebody else. I cannot possibly enrich another human being's life if my life is not enriched simultaneously.

Last year I had a religious experience, what I call a truly religious experience. It came at the time in conjunction with Passover and Easter. I reread the Bible, the original translation, in which God manifests himself to Moses, and when Moses asks in Hebrew, "What

is your name?" The answer that came back, and the real meaning of that answer was, "Truly, I am everything that is to be." If God, in essence, is everything that is to be, then what we do as human beings in our making ourselves in the image of God, is to be everything that we are. Not everything that someone else says, not everything that someone else wants us to be, but everything that we are. And other people must be everything that they are. You have to say, I can be me and you can be you and if we can get ourselves together then we have made it. And that is the coolest, grooviest, greatest, total kind of spiritual thing you can ever have. If I am me and you are you and if we touch each other, we really touch each other, then we have got it together. You see, there is a double thing here. Not only do we get so much beauty by doing this, if you don't do it you're cheating yourself.

What we all have in common is the privacy of our own relationships, in our communicating with others; there isn't any interference. There is only you and that other person and you are relating to each other. When you get into each other's world and begin to experience each other's world, there really that's where it's at.

Those of us who have been fortunate in one way (and I don't know how fortunate we are), in having had no sensory handicap, or any other handicap (like being born poor in an affluent society), we really don't know what the struggle is and we really don't know what it means, and it really is unfortunate. And for those of us who really have no way of understanding about a world that we can't touch, we really don't use what we have. For those of you, on the other hand, who may have adjusted to whatever your handicap is, you are governed by the following principle: That is, one of the greatest things that occurs in human behavior is when you turn a *liability into an asset*. I am old enough to know that I've gone by that struggling, striving, agonizing, time when I was trying to be like someone else and not me. I've gone by that turning point, and I wouldn't want to be young again. As I evolve and grow it's kind of beautiful. I had a lot of hang-ups when I was a kid, but I now know that every single thing that happened in my life led me to this spot. My point is that when we turn around, when we reach that point in our own lives, then we say, "Hey, whatever I am is me, whatever I am is something to be proud of, I think that is just fantastic." To be proud of your being, to say first to yourself, and then to the world, "I am me—I am a very special me—I love me, and in my dedication to my being me, I not only become me, I provide the example for many of us."

I want to make a last point about immortality, my definition of immortality. I believe that my immortality is directly related to

what kind of contact I had even if I don't get feedback. I really believe that my being here has had some kind of impact on you, and your being here has unquestionably had an impact on me. It makes no difference how long you stay, it makes all the difference that you were there. And so it is a kind of human relating—I know you and you know me and we know each other together, we love what I call our psychic child. And that psychic child is impenetrable, and absolutely immortal. And nobody can take that away from us. And that is the excitement of being a lover, a teacher, and most of all, of being a human being.

Thank you.

II. Positive Response

LARRY G. STEWART

Editor

Following Dr. Albert Ross' powerful and moving "Love-In" talk, the Forum participants divided into small groups of approximately 25 people to a group. Each group was led by a facilitator, and each had a recorder and an interpreter. The first session for these 20 groups was unique in nature. It was designed to foster the sharing of information and elicit positive feelings and thoughts on the part of the participants toward the many issues and topics involved in the education of deaf children and youth. The objective of this approach was to begin the FORUM in a positive manner, provide some identification of terms used, and to stimulate thinking for the sessions that were to follow.

The group facilitators began by saying: "I have a list of words relating to the education of the deaf. Each of you will be asked to make a positive, uncritical statement about a different item. The purpose of this first session is for information and sensitivity."

The list of items presented to the parents, teachers, deaf youngsters, and others in the small groups was:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Summerhill | 13. National Theater of the Deaf |
| 2. Day Classes | 14. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare |
| 3. Day Schools | 15. Speech and Lipreading |
| 4. Residential Schools | 16. Sign Language/Fingerspelling |
| 5. Adult Education | 17. Open School |
| 6. Auditory Training | 18. Individualized Instruction |
| 7. Total Communication | 19. Language Development |
| 8. Gallaudet College | 20. Work-Study Programs |
| 9. National Technical Institute for the Deaf | 21. Public School Integration |
| 10. San Fernando Valley State College | 22. Teacher Training |
| 11. Junior and Technical Colleges | 23. Parent Education |
| 12. Deaf Adult Involvement | 24. Student Exchange Programs |
| | 25. Dormitory Counselors |

The following discussion highlights the nature of the responses of the group members to these 25 words:

1. *Summerhill*

- A. A group started in England in 1930. The theme was that children *did not have to* do anything. When the child decided he wanted to learn, he could become involved in school activities.
- B. A group of students with a feeling for others, in an ungraded school stressing self-discipline
- C. A free, happy school with a pleasant atmosphere where children can engage in free and unstructured activities. It is a family-style school.
- D. A book based upon the idea that the teacher is a facilitator, motivating children to learn.
- E. A very liberal school in England.
- F. The Model Secondary School for the Deaf tries to use some of the concepts from Summerhill. The students select their own government, and thereby learn responsibility.
- G. Allows all children to decide their own discipline. There are no failures.
- H. A school that works with the emotionally disturbed. It is unstructured, and permits growth of the individual according to his own needs.
- I. A unique education system; complete freedom in selection of curriculum.
- J. Self-government by students. No child has to go to classes but they do.
- K. Where the concept of teaching changed to that of facilitating learning. Teachers and students are on the same level and learning together. The belief was that communication would result from shared learning experiences.

2. *Day Classes*

- A. Day classes are classes in public schools which are separate from general classes. Children attend classes during the day and go home after school.
- B. They are good because they result in integration, are close to home, help to stabilize the family, and hearing people have the chance to get to know deaf children.
- C. The children can be in contact with the parents on a daily basis.
- D. The children can learn to communicate with hearing people.
- E. Can be good for the children if teachers are good.
- F. Day classes for the deaf are in schools for the hearing. Thus, the school is not just for deaf children.

- G. Great for those that have skilled teachers. Family closeness will be beneficial, but the view of the deaf shared by most adults may cause problems for the child.

3. *Day Schools*

- A. Keeps children in home and neighborhood situation.
- B. More deaf children in day schools than in day classes, thus making more homogeneous grouping possible.
- C. Teachers and staff have more opportunities to work with parents.
- D. Day schools give greater visibility to the communication problems of the deaf.
- E. Day schools have good professional supervision.
- F. Day schools provide competition among students.
- G. Day schools are for deaf children.
- H. They tend to have a well-advanced curriculum.

4. *Residential Schools*

- A. A "living-in" school for deaf children.
- B. Good for children from broken homes or whose homes are disruptive.
- C. Provide educational opportunities for deaf children who are from areas where no special classes are available for deaf children.
- D. Provide many after-class recreation and social activities.
- E. Provide opportunities for peer relationships and free communication, thus fostering good interpersonal relationships.
- F. Can also serve as a day school.
- G. Offer a comprehensive educational program with large professional staff. This makes possible a variety of services and some continuity in curriculum from pre-school to high school.
- H. Children feel accepted by their peers and the adults in the school environment.
- I. More opportunities for athletic competition and leadership experience.
- J. Help child to learn to live and get along with others.

5. *Adult Education*

- A. Education for all age levels during adulthood for those who want to advance academically or vocationally; continuing education.
- B. To learn more skills for advanced employment.
- C. Deaf adults seem more motivated toward learning.
- D. An opportunity to grow further, not always related to work.
- E. Good if English and reading are used as stepping stones to move on to better understanding of other subjects.

- F. Helps deaf adults to become better citizens.
 - G. Needed desperately by deaf adults who did not graduate from school.
 - H. Good for parents; helps them learn to communicate with their deaf children (via manual communication).
 - I. Advances the employment of the deaf by improving and upgrading their skills.
 - J. Reduce isolation of deaf individuals by bringing them together with deaf and hearing people.
6. *Auditory Training*
- A. Modern auditory training equipment produces better results.
 - B. A method of helping deaf people with their communication hearing and speech).
 - C. Necessary for child who has residual hearing; helps child to use remaining hearing. Important for increased awareness of his environment.
 - D. Helps child enjoy music.
7. *Total Communication*
- A. Using anything and everything to communicate with a deaf child.
 - B. May be the answer for the deaf child not succeeding orally.
 - C. An opportunity for the deaf person to use and benefit from all means of communication.
 - D. Using one's whole being in relating to another being.
 - E. A wonderful addition to oral teaching.
 - F. Helping the deaf child to understand his total environment.
 - G. Total communication is wonderful; it's the best thing for all deaf people.
 - H. Total communication helps language develop.
 - I. A philosophy toward communicating with deaf people that gives each method (speech, lipreading, fingerspelling, sign language, etc.) equal importance.
 - J. Total communication is to the deaf what Summerhill is to education.
 - K. Total communication represents a departure from the approach of fitting one method to all children.
8. *Gallaudet College*
- A. The only liberal arts college for the deaf in the world.
 - B. Without Gallaudet many deaf people could not go on to higher education.
 - C. It helps deaf people develop a positive self-concept.
 - D. An opportunity for deaf youth to grow and mature.
 - E. Gallaudet has an excellent curriculum.

- F. Gallaudet has many deaf professional instructors.
 - G. A place of hope for deaf people, and a wonderful advertisement for deaf people to the many visitors who tour Gallaudet.
 - H. God bless it! May it grow and grow!
9. *National Technical Institute for the Deaf*
- A. A college where deaf people can get technical training or education in an integrated setting (Rochester Institute of Technology).
 - B. A new dimension in the education of the deaf offering training in scientific areas.
 - C. NTID has excellent training programs.
 - D. An innovative approach in the education of the deaf.
 - E. It helps hearing people learn about deaf people.
 - F. NTID uses interpreters when deaf students are in classes having professors who do not use sign language.
 - G. Helps deaf students to learn to socialize with hearing peers.
 - H. A good and necessary addition to opportunities for deaf people.
10. *California State University, Northridge*
- A. A state university in Northridge, California, which offers undergraduate training opportunities for deaf students and for those who want to work with the deaf.
 - B. Provides leadership training.
 - C. A wonderful place to learn sign language and interpreting.
 - D. Provides scholarship to children of deaf parents.
 - E. Famous for LTP (Leadership Training Program in the area of the Deaf).
 - F. Develops leadership in the field of deafness.
 - G. It has led to new horizons for deaf people.
 - H. It's a good place for the deaf to go to school with hearing students.
 - I. It is a catalyst—a place of encouragement for deaf people to succeed as professionals.
 - J. Provides sensitivity training and increased awareness of others as human beings.
11. *Junior and Technical Colleges*
- A. Additional post secondary training opportunities for deaf youngsters within an integrated setting.
 - B. Good because instruction is interpreted.
 - C. Good if support services are available.
 - D. Give deaf students a chance to obtain advanced education close to home.
 - E. Fill a gap between Gallaudet and NTID.

12. *Deaf Adult Involvement*

- A. Involving deaf people in planning and implementing programs that serve them.
- B. Makes deaf people more involved and aware of the community in which they live.
- C. Participation by deaf people in community affairs.
- D. The right of all adults to be involved in programs for their benefit.
- E. Important in making the community aware of the real needs of deaf people.
- F. Gives deaf people more self-respect.
- G. Helps foster a positive image of deaf people.
- H. Provides deaf people with an opportunity to help plan their own future.
- I. Helps them learn leadership skills.
- J. Deaf people should be involved in activities that concern them just as other groups are.
- K. Much more involvement today than in the past, and they have made a real contribution.
- L. It is good for young deaf people to see deaf adults involved. This provides a good model for them.
- M. There is a need for a "Ralph Nader" among deaf people.
- N. All for the good!

13. *National Theatre for the Deaf*

- A. A national company of deaf and hearing actors; part of the Eugene O'Neill Foundation.
- B. Good. It helps the public to develop a positive image of deaf people.
- C. Shows the public the beauty of sign language.
- D. Opens new careers for talented deaf people.
- E. Improves the self-image of deaf people.
- F. Thrilling; wonderful; great public relations medium.
- G. Great pushers of "deaf pride."

14. *Department of Health, Education and Welfare*

- A. Provides funds for most of the work being done with deaf people.
- B. An effort to help all people.
- C. Helps to rehabilitate and educate all handicapped people.
- D. Media Services and Captioned Films.
- E. Involves deaf consumers in some of its decision making and program administration.
- F. Good, but may it get better.

- G. Has made a tremendous contribution to the lives of deaf people.
 - H. Most national programs for the deaf are funded by DHEW.
15. *Speech and Lipreading*
- A. Helps the deaf person to function with hearing people, which is vital.
 - B. Good if the deaf child can do it.
 - C. Parts of the total communication concept.
 - D. Opportunities to communicate with others.
 - E. Helps the deaf person to integrate with society.
16. *Sign Language/Fingerspelling*
- A. Wonderful! The best thing that has happened to deaf people since the Declaration of Independence in 1776.
 - B. Essential parts of total communication.
 - C. Permit the deaf person to communicate and learn with comfort and ease.
 - D. Are within reach of all who care to learn them.
 - E. Enable deaf people to achieve their fullest potentials.
 - F. Essential for the great majority of deaf people in order for them to develop and grow into educated, well-adjusted adults.
 - G. The basic language of all people (body language).
17. *Open Schools*
- A. Schools characterized by involvement on the part of all concerned—pupils, parents, teachers, the community.
 - B. Where children can learn spontaneously and with a minimum of structure.
 - C. They encourage self-responsibility.
 - D. No walls; children can move about as they wish. Each child can learn at his own pace.
 - E. A concept enjoyed by students and teachers.
 - F. The Model Secondary School for the Deaf is an open school.
 - G. The teachers are resource people rather than lecturers!
 - H. Learning at each child's individual level and speed.
 - I. Students learn to set their own goals.
18. *Individualized Instruction*
- A. Excellent from the learner's point of view.
 - B. Instruction that fits the needs of each student.
 - C. The student proceeds at his own rate.
 - D. Good if the learner has adequate learning materials.
 - E. No child is left out.
 - F. Gearing instruction to the individual student's needs and desires.

- G. An instructional approach that is basic to the concept of an open school.
19. *Language Development*
- A. Very important for deaf children. Schools are trying to find better ways of helping the deaf child to develop his language.
 - B. Goes together with total communication.
 - C. Begins in the home.
 - D. More important for the child than speech and lipreading.
 - E. Necessary for reading and writing.
 - F. Permits interpersonal communication.
20. *Work-Study Programs*
- A. Designed to give the student some work experience and exposure to the world of work, while having the opportunity to integrate his experiences with classroom instruction.
 - B. Helps child to develop work skills and attitudes.
 - C. Encourages the deaf student to seek post-secondary education.
 - D. Provides opportunities for transfer of learning.
 - E. Of practical value to deaf students.
 - F. A growth incentive program.
 - G. Helps educate employers about the abilities of deaf people.
21. *Public School Integration*
- A. Good to integrate deaf and hearing children; they can learn from one another.
 - B. Good if the deaf child has teachers and peers with whom he can communicate.
 - C. Better for the more able deaf student.
 - D. Many benefits can come from integration.
22. *Teacher Training*
- A. Helps to recruit and train teachers for deaf children.
 - B. Good if director knows the problems and needs of deaf people of all ages.
 - C. Some teacher training programs are good.
 - D. More and more are accepting deaf people as trainees.
 - E. More are sending trainees into the homes of deaf people to give them exposure to deaf adults.
 - F. A very necessary program, especially if viewed as continuing education for practicing teachers.
23. *Parent Education*
- A. A vital aspect of the education of deaf children.
 - B. Helps parents understand their deaf child and to learn to communicate with him.

- C. Parents help school and children by sharing knowledge and skills with the school.
- D. Parents are doing more and more to shape school policy.
- E. Essential for parents of all children, but more so for parents of deaf children.
- F. The more parent education, the better it will be for deaf children.
- G. Good, provided educators of parents are themselves educated.

24. *Student Exchange Programs*

- A. Good. Results in greater understanding of deafness on the part of hearing people and broadens the experience base of deaf students.
- B. Deaf students and hearing students learning side by side.
- C. Introduces the deaf student to success with hearing students.
- D. Motivates the deaf student to go on to higher education in schools for the hearing.
- E. Exchange of ideas and learning experiences among different types of schools should be beneficial.

25. *Dormitory Counselors*

- A. Good in many cases where they can communicate with deaf children.
- B. Can be extremely important in the lives of deaf children in residential schools.
- C. Good only if properly trained, with proper experience and the right personal qualities.
- D. Would be better if salaries were higher than they are now.
- E. Qualified counselors can help deaf children in many ways.
- F. Dormitory counselors are surrogate parents for deaf children while they are at school.

III. What Is Learning

FRANK BOWE
Editor

Learning is—changing behavior; conditioning the mind; a private thing; motivated by rewards; related to the total environment; cognitive, affective and psychomotor; not synonymous with teaching; not dependent upon adult guidance; and many other things.

Apparently satisfied with this variety of definitions for the term "learning," the group members moved on to consider different aspects of learning as they relate to the deaf child. Their discussions led them to consider nonverbal communication; the nature of language; the role of the school in learning; parent education; and teacher training.

NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION

Participants agreed that a deaf child's earliest learning is nonverbal in nature. They further agreed that much of the most important learning in anyone's life is nonverbal. This area, they felt, has been too long ignored by persons concerned with the education of deaf children.

Learning begins with percepts and concepts. The deaf child perceives persons and things in his immediate environment long before he becomes aware of language. He somehow conceptualizes those persons and things that are important to him, only later assigning names to his concepts.

One of the most important areas of nonverbal communication is that of acceptance or rejection by significant others. A mother can show love to her deaf child without having to use language. In fact, participants agreed, she *must* show her love nonverbally as well as verbally, especially to language-deprived children.

Much affective learning is nonverbal in nature. The child learns he is loved, cared for, accepted. He then learns to love others. He

can learn all of this without language, but he seems to need language for further refinement in his learning.

THE NATURE OF LANGUAGE

Participants generally felt that language is seldom taught. Rather, the child somehow "picks it up," plays with it, modifies his usage to conform with that of others, and uses it to learn more.

With profoundly deaf-born children, this process stumbles to a halt at the beginning—the deaf child simply does not "pick up" language without special assistance. Participants argued that we must accept whatever language the child does generate, suggest a more proper way to express his thoughts, and help him to use this better language.

Is sign language a genuine language in itself? This question generated some heated discussion. Not, as might be expected, on its linguistic merits (structure, syntax) but on its separateness from English. One participant in particular argued hotly that signs were simply a medium for expressing English. Others argued equally passionately that sign language is a language in its own right, with its own distinctive features. These discussants drew a distinction between what Lou Fant calls Siglish (Signed English) and Ameslan (American Sign Language), agreeing that the former is not a language in itself, but insisting that the latter is.

Participants agreed that much language learning takes place outside the classroom walls. They disagreed, however, whether this was altogether a good thing. Some members pointed to the ease with which the children communicate on the playground, suggesting that communication is meant to be this way—easy, effective and enjoyable—regardless of whether the children are always adhering to standard English usage. Others strongly disagreed, insisting that the children should use proper English at all times, in order to learn it and to learn to use it habitually.

This argument quite naturally led the group members into a consideration of cognitive vs. affective learning. Again, a debate emerged between those believing in the primacy of cognitive learning (the child must learn proper English) and those pointing to the affective needs of the child (the child must feel free to communicate in whatever way he feels most comfortable). Although they failed to resolve this dilemma, many participants did agree that the way we treat the child is the key which largely determines how much and what kind of language he will learn.

ROLE OF THE SCHOOL IN LEARNING: THE CLASSROOM

Group discussions on the role of the school in the learning process focused on the problems of relating what is learned in school with what is "out there in real life." Members considered the after-school hours as well as the classroom in their deliberations.

A number of participants criticized the classroom structure itself. One man who has visited many schools commented that it seemed as though all the teachers had received the same rubber-stamp training—he found "drill, drill, drill" the rule in practically every class he visited. Others criticized the outdated curriculum. A deaf woman remarked that she had visited a school which was attempting to incorporate new media equipment and other recent innovations—without updating its 1950 curriculum.

Several comments were made in reference to the Craig and Collins study which found teachers dominating the classroom discussions. There was agreement that the children often learn by doing and that they should have more opportunity for learning as opposed to being taught.

Another area frequently discussed was that of the relationship between what goes on in the classroom and "real life." One group emphasized the ambiguity of the term "real life": just what are we talking about? Other groups felt that the classroom "should help the real life style". As one teacher put it: "First tell them, then take them out and show them."

One group devoted the bulk of its time in this session to the question of whether the schools prepare children for life outside the school walls. One man remarked that this depends on the school—residential schools are less related to real life than are day schools. Another man commented that much classroom learning is not of practical use after school, nor should it be. He felt that the school itself is a part of real life: "Whatever school you attend—this is real life, a part of your life."

The suggestion was made that more cooperative programs be instituted in the schools for the deaf. An example would be work-study programs. One educator, whose views were echoed by many others, felt that the senior year was too late for this—it should begin in the fourth or fifth grade, with the students well prepared before they enter the program.

Another suggestion was that exchange programs with local high schools be established. The Maryland School, for example, has classes involving deaf and hearing students. The classes meet three times weekly in Frederick High School. Not only do the deaf stu-

dents benefit from this exposure to the "hearing world," but the hearing students are learning about deafness first hand.

Some participants raised the question of whether the classroom situation encourages the children to *think*. One educator posed the theory that the children are told what to do from the time they are babies—what time to get up, what to eat, where to go. He felt that the children should be given more responsibility at an earlier age. They should be encouraged to "try their wings," and make their own mistakes. There was much agreement on this need for the children to shoulder more responsibility for their own actions.

Others took a different approach. "Deaf children are not ready to take responsibility for their actions," said one teacher. Another man remarked that "the purpose of school is to make it unnecessary to make the mistakes of others. This is important knowledge and must be taught."

One group focused on the "real life" problem on the college level. It was noted that some graduates of Gallaudet are not prepared to get a job. Three persons in this group wanted Gallaudet to prepare students for vocations rather than continue as a liberal arts college. Questions were raised about students going to Gallaudet when they could be more appropriately placed at NTID or some other program.

Administrators came in for their share of the blame for the schools being too different from "real life." One person commented that many teachers begin the year with exciting and innovative plans for involving the children in the community only to be "shot down" by administrators who fear possible repercussions. He remarked that administrators might be the root of the "different from real life" problem. Others in his group pointed to the teachers, saying that they were trained to be rigid in their teaching and want to stay that way. There was general agreement in this group that "something is wrong with teacher training."

A deaf man expressed concern that many of his friends were not prepared for such real life problems as finding jobs, getting insurance, and paying taxes while in schools. Another member of his group added that hearing children do not get this in school either.

Several participants suggested that education and vocational rehabilitation personnel cooperate more closely so as to provide the students with instruction in such practical matters as Social Security, banking and savings accounts, employment opportunities and problems, public transportation, how to apply for jobs, insurance, and apartments. The American School for the Deaf has such a program. At the Tennessee School, similar topics are treated in a "consumer education" course.

Surprisingly little time was devoted to the question of cognitive vs. affective learning. However, those group members who did comment on this issue felt that the schools generally were stressing cognitive learning at the expense of affective learning. Said one father: "They're so busy stuffing the kids' heads with facts and making him talk, that they ignore their personal needs."

One rehabilitation worker referred to Dr. Ross's comments on children not being loved at home. We must teach these children to accept themselves and other people. We can't just teach them to read and write, but must change their feelings about life. "If this is not done at home, it must be done at the school. It must be done before the school can even consider cognitive learning," he concluded.

ROLE OF THE SCHOOL IN LEARNING: AFTER-SCHOOL

"I felt boxed-in at school." This revealing comment by a young deaf woman summarizes what many group members felt: the schools for the deaf, particularly the residential schools, appear to have been too highly regimented and isolated from the "real world" outside the school walls. Too often, the child's learning opportunities have been largely restricted to the limited range of activities offered by his school. In some schools, this range is further restricted by the lack of a well-planned after-school program.

One of the points discussants emphasized repeatedly was that the children should be themselves responsible for planning many of their after-school activities. A minority disagreed, stating that deaf children are not able to make decisions.

Another point was that the after-school activities should expose the children both to deaf adults and to hearing people. This exposure provides him with information he can use in deciding which "society" to enter upon leaving school. Discussants hoped the child would be prepared to enter either or both "worlds," depending on his personal preference.

Many group members expressed the belief that deaf adults have not had the opportunities to get to know the "hearing world" intimately. They feel the younger deaf people are better prepared to do this and should be encouraged to do so.

One problem with giving the children more responsibility in the schools is that this often creates confusion among the school staff. The administrators are concerned when they think there is danger of some kind of difficulty. The children are accepting responsibility, however, argued many discussants, and should be given the

chance to decide for themselves how they wish to organize their after-school activities. A number of deaf youth and adults complained bitterly about the many rules and regulations with which they were saddled, especially in the dorms, and argued, often passionately, for more freedom.

On another aspect of the after-school issue, many discussants felt that learning is related to the person's daily experiences. If his daily life is largely confined to school activities, his learning will be similarly restricted. Group members issued a call for more out-of-school activities, in which they felt the students should have a role in the planning.

Student involvement in school administration was also discussed. Some members felt that if the students were given opportunity to become involved in governing the school, their contributions would not only help the school but would help the students themselves as well. Others felt that the students had no place in the decision-making process.

It was noted that at Gallaudet two students are now on the curriculum committee and that this has brought about an improvement in course offerings. At MSSD the technique of micro-courses is used in an attempt to give the students an opportunity to acquire the necessary knowledge to understand a single concept, e.g., how a chicken develops from an egg. Many such micro-courses begin with a student's question, followed by the offering of a course by a qualified and interested teacher.

Dorm life was another topic considered in the discussions of after-school life. Dorm personnel were considered to be very important in the development of the deaf child. This indicates a need for people with good training to staff the dorms. In order to attract qualified people, the schools should offer salary and status comparable to those enjoyed by teachers. One objection to dorm counselors was that they often attempt to take the place of parents, something they cannot do. Group members agreed that the role of the dorm counselor was difficult and important, and urged the schools to attract and train qualified personnel.

PARENT EDUCATION

Discussion was often heated on the issue of parent education, with parents of deaf children actively participating. Groups accepted without much debate the proposition that parents are in a position to facilitate learning in the deaf child. Their comments centered around three problems: (1) providing accurate information to the parents soon after the discovery of the child's deafness; (2) involv-

ing parents in the educational life of the school; and (3) coordinating what the child learns at home with what he learns in school.

One preliminary distinction made by numerous groups was that between day and residential schools, with discussion focusing on the different roles parents assume in each. Pros and cons were raised with respect to both. Some discussants felt the residential school "took-over" too much of the child's life, whereas others believed that it provided a child with much-needed opportunities to relate meaningfully with his peers. Day schools provide more opportunity for a "normal" home life, but at the same time it is hard for the child because too many parents cannot communicate effectively with their deaf children.

The participants felt it would be important to focus attention on the family as a whole, not just on the deaf child. The first big step seems to be that of bringing the child closer to the family. The Tennessee School for the Deaf has a program with the Tennessee School of Social Work in which graduate students from TSSW have practicum with families of deaf children, trying to bring the families closer together. Many participants felt that this family unity should assume higher priority than the "integration" issue. They felt that only after we have assured the child of a loving and supportive home can we begin to consider his adjustment problems outside the home.

EARLY PARENT EDUCATION

Parents repeatedly commented that early contacts with professionals were detrimental to family solidarity because each person gave different advice. "I was told that signs were gross," was one typical comment. A number of parents expressed bitterness about this early contact with professionals.

Groups focused upon deciding just what information parents should receive upon learning of their child's deafness. One aspect of this early parent education that received strong support was the concept of total communication. "Communication is essential," said one father of a deaf teenager. "We tried our best to be oral, but we never really communicated about important things. He talked with his peers." There was general agreement among the various groups that the child must be enabled and encouraged to interact actively in the family constellation, and that this end is best achieved in the family which embraces total communication.

The mental health aspects of having a deaf child should also be communicated to the parents, discussants agreed. It is traumatic to have a deaf child, regardless of the hearing status of the parents. There are more commonalities than differences among deaf and

hearing parents. Parents should be informed and counseled about the realities of deafness so they will better be able to accept and love their child. Parents should also be aware that before one can communicate with, accept or love one's child, one has to care for and accept one's self. This ties in with Dr. Ross's comments.

A number of parents commented on the many frustrations they faced in bringing up their deaf children in the absence of appropriate professional advice and guidance. "I felt anger and frustrations building up and up. If you lead a life of this frustration, you are bound to become mentally ill," remarked one father.

Many of these frustrations grew out of the lack of communication in the home. One parent told of her boy flushing his hearing aid down the toilet in reaction to his parents' inability to communicate.

Other parents focused on their feelings about deafness. One mother remarked that she had often feared for her child's differentness and was afraid of captioned films and tele-typewriters because they seemed to emphasize her child's differentness. She reported that counseling had helped her, but wondered if the help had come too late.

It was noted that very few materials for parents of deaf children are currently available, aside from the Tracy correspondence course materials. TRIPOD is one attempt to educate parents early on the realities of deafness. The three facets of TRIPOD are parents, professionals and deaf adults, all of whom get together to help the deaf child. Parents were often pleased with this tripartite approach. They emphasized the need for parents to become acquainted with deaf adults in order to form realistic images of what their children might become. Group participants noted that some parents demonstrate an apparent lack of interest in their deaf children. There was agreement that this seeming disinterest indicates a need for parental counseling. They drew a sharp distinction between this and parent education. The need for early and individualized parental counseling received much emphasis.

Concern was expressed over which professionals should be involved in parent education and counseling. One parent remarked that churchmen may give inappropriate advice, ("God gave you this special child"). Others emphasized the need for professionals skilled in the problems of early childhood education. Advice from physicians was felt to have been grossly misleading at times.

Another topic the groups discussed was the apparent lack of participation by deaf parents in parent education programs. "Why do deaf parents not come?" wondered one discussant. "Do they doubt they know the answers or feel that the school people can't communicate with them?" A deaf parent answered his question affirmatively: "The problem is communication in group settings. The

leader must communicate with signs or have an interpreter. Also, many, professionals do not know deaf adults well. Another deaf man commented that many deaf adults have emotional reactions to school people because of their experiences while in school. The feeling was often expressed that all school personnel who have contact with parents should be required to demonstrate effective two-way communication both with hearing parents and with deaf parents.

Involving Parents in the Educational Process

A father commented that "as a group we parents don't feel welcome. I know we're welcome to visit but we get the feeling that we're not welcome in educational programming." A teacher in his group responded: "I teach in a small day school. If you're not involved, it is the school's fault."

Many groups agreed that the schools have a responsibility to offer parents opportunities for real involvement in their children's education. One man remarked: "The schools are good at milking money from the parents, but are not willing to listen to suggestions for improving the educational system."

An administrator stated that it was difficult to get the parents to come to schools where the history is one of failure. In Alabama, one school has parents stay at the school for two weeks before the child is admitted. When the parents understand the school better, they will be more willing to help.

Another problem raising the issue of parental involvement is that of how much freedom the school should give its residential students. The difficulty is that too much freedom brings frequent criticism from worried parents, whereas too little freedom likewise brings criticism that the school is not preparing the children for responsibility and for the "real world." Many participants agreed that at the present time the residential schools are too protective, but disagreed on what to do about it. This issue proved quite explosive, as many parents passionately accused the residential schools of encroaching on the parents' responsibilities as parents. Perhaps only close cooperation and consultation between the administrators and parents can resolve this impasse.

Coordination of School and Home Life

One found repeatedly among the various groups was that of the "two worlds every week" syndrome. School life and home life were felt by participants to be unnecessarily different. "We became

a weekend entertainment group," commented one father. The feeling among many group members was that the schools and the parents must get together in order to better coordinate the child's learning. "My son learns one thing in school, then another at home. He became confused," said a mother. She added that we must take care that parents do not destroy at home what is learned by the child in school.

A parent suggested that one way to coordinate the work of parents and school personnel is to involve both groups in sign language courses. This often alleviates fear and misconceptions on both sides. Another way would be for both groups to meet regularly with deaf adults.

Coordination can also provide for learning carry over in the child. If parents know what the child is learning in school, they can supplement that learning at home, and vice versa.

One large problem is that many parents divorce themselves from the child's problems once he enters school. They have encountered so many difficulties during the preschool years that they have all but given up on the struggle. One administrator noted that with some parents at his school, he sees them only at the time of admission and at graduation. On the other hand, schools sometimes give up on "problem" children and send them home to parents who are ill-equipped to handle them. Again, proper counseling of parent and child (and perhaps the school) would be beneficial.

One suggestion that was made involved closing state schools and "putting it all back on the parents," using school staff as resources. Other group members rejected this idea, contending that the home is not the proper place for formal education.

A teacher complained that many parents do not require children to assume household responsibilities during their weekend and vacation visits. She added that when the children graduate, they have a difficult time adjusting to all of the sudden responsibilities.

Another teacher commented: "How can a child feel he belongs when his parents write 'Do not send Johnny home this weekend because Grandma has his bed.'? In other cases, parents may abdicate from communicating with the child by placing written notes in his room telling him what to do. Again, how does that make the child feel? Group members felt that responsibility must be placed on the child's shoulders both at home and at school. These responsibilities, they felt, should be consistently enforced so that the child will not use the school against the parents and vice versa (i.e., "Why should I pick up my clothes? I never have to do that at home.")

A deaf man suggested that the schools support parent education groups to help them understand what is necessary and important for success at home and at school. He added that the schools

should provide channels for parents to express their desires about education to the school personnel. There seems to be a lot of misunderstanding among parents and school personnel. On the one hand, parents often say the school never listens to them. On the other, school personnel complain that the parents are not interested. Coordination seems to be the only answer. As one deaf adult put it: "We can't talk about two separate things. They need both an effective school and a supportive home."

Teacher Preparation

A good deal of discussion centered around the issue of teacher preparation. Some group members criticized the type of training given teachers, say that this training often produces teachers who are rigidly committed to outdated methods. Others felt that some of the problem lies in the teachers themselves: "Some teachers just do not have the children at heart," complained one parent.

Some support was given to the suggestion that teachers live on campus for a period of time in order to get to know the children better.

Several Group members criticized the way teachers-in-training are evaluated. As one deaf man said: "Some people can teach and some can't. I feel that certification is nonsense. You can score highly and still teach poorly." Another deaf person, a minister, added: "To go into the ministry you must have extensive physical and psychological examinations. Teaching is as important but all you have here is a grade point average."

A professor of deaf education responded: "We are in a state university and as long as a person has a certain grade point average we cannot keep him out of the program. We are now going to have to work out something else." There was general consensus that deaf teachers should be involved at all educational levels, including pre-school. A deaf woman felt that "99%" of superintendents and supervisors choose teachers because they can hear and not because they can teach. She added: "I would also like to make a plea to the Council on the Education of the Deaf to reevaluate all teacher training programs in the U.S. and that none should be approved that have only one philosophy of teaching the deaf and that exclude deaf applicants."

A hearing woman responded: "Some teachers think if you learn a few signs that makes you capable of being a better teacher. Seems to me that the teachers of the deaf should learn more of the real needs of the child."

A deaf man commented that he has taught teachers-in-training and was able to determine which ones wanted to be teachers of the

deaf. He felt that sign language courses should be incorporated into all teacher training centers.

Two men, one deaf and one hearing, agreed that teachers talk too much in the classroom. They felt, along with many others in various groups, that the children should be allowed to intercommunicate. "There should be less teaching and more learning," concluded the hearing man. The deaf man added that teacher training centers should prepare teachers to be facilitators more than dictators.

Some group members were concerned that teachers expect either too much or too little from the children. Many teachers set unrealistically high goals in speech and language, leading both teacher and student to bitter frustration. Other teachers take the "Deaf children can't. . . ." route and use this as an excuse for not teaching as well as they might. Participants agreed that teachers-in-training should be prepared to expect deaf children to be limited in some ways and unlimited in others. Until teachers have realistic expectations, they felt, deaf children as a group will not reach their potentials.

The participants agreed that, in general, teacher training leaves much to be desired. They gave high priority to improvement in this area and urged the field to reevaluate its efforts to train better teachers of deaf children.

High school and college deaf students in the groups were quite vocal in giving their opinion on how the deaf person learns. Some students felt that learning would increase if teachers and other adults would learn to use manual communication effectively and would take the time to discuss and explain things more fully. A number of students felt that teachers are not tough enough on their students and tend to excuse them because of their deafness.

Most deaf participants agreed that a multi-sensory approach should be used in educating deaf children but felt that vision should be stressed. As one deaf person put it—"What I see I remember." Another stated that he learned mainly by imitating the action of others.

LEARNING APPROACHES IN THE EDUCATION OF THE DEAF: YESTERDAY, TODAY, AND TOMORROW

Participants agreed that in the past education was limited primarily to the school setting (and to some extent this is true even today). In the future, education must become a true partnership involving the parent, teacher and child. There was strong feeling

expressed that schools must assume more responsibility for informing parents as to what to expect from their deaf child.

A number of innovative approaches to deaf education were discussed. A teacher from Gallaudet College suggested that since the structure of sign language is different from English that perhaps English should be taught as a second language to deaf children. Another suggestion for improving education would be to have all classes made up of both deaf and hearing children and have everyone in the school use total communication. A deaf participant suggested that more deaf people be given an opportunity to teach at the pre-school level since they have an in-depth understanding of the feelings of deaf children and could serve as role models.

IV. The Deaf Person and Learning

FRANK BOWE
Editor

This session was devoted to a discussion of the following four topics: (1) How Does the Deaf Person Learn?; (2) Learning Approaches in the Education of the Deaf: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow; (3) Learning to Learn, and (4) Developing Sensitivity to Issues and Problems. These four topics generated a great deal of discussion and expression of feeling.

HOW DOES THE DEAF PERSON LEARN?

At the beginning of this session participants were encouraged to be forward thinking and constructive in their deliberations. Much of the discussion followed this pattern although at times there was a tendency to fall back into criticizing past mistakes.

It was obvious that most participants felt that the deaf child learns much like any other child. A deaf man pointed out that "deaf children learn like other children only if information is presented in a way that they can assimilate it." This is crucial.

Participants felt that experience is the great teacher, whether the child be deaf or hearing. Experience develops the child's confidence and self concept.

Age of onset of deafness was noted as one of the critical factors influencing the learning rate of the deaf child. The importance of reaching the child during the early formative years was stressed. It was suggested that all sensory inputs and methods of communication be utilized as soon as deafness is discovered. Since each child has his own peculiar learning style, it was felt that the method be fitted to the child and not vice versa.

Deaf participants particularly stressed the importance of parents accepting their child for what he is. One person stated it thusly, "When parents accept deafness, the child truly knows what love is." In order that parents be able to express the love that they feel for

their child it was strongly urged that they learn and use manual communication. Only in this way can the deaf child fully share the family experience.

The role of the family in the education of the deaf child was repeatedly stressed. The feeling seemed to be that the ultimate success or failure of the child inevitably goes back to the family.

Some parents felt that they are often wrongly accused of resisting changes in communication methodology. When, in fact, they are only doing what they have been told by professionals. It was agreed that parents should be much more involved in the educational system. Some suggested that parents be invited to serve on school boards and on curriculum committees.

There was general consensus that schools are not adequately preparing students for the life they will face after graduation. The need for more incidental learning opportunities in schools was repeatedly stressed.

Again and again the groups returned to the importance of everyone who comes in contact with the deaf child knowing total communication. It was stressed that since students in residential schools spend 18 hours a day outside the classroom, houseparents and other staff should be able to communicate fluently.

The feeling seemed to be that total communication is the tool that can bridge the gap between the deaf child and his environment. Through total communication the deaf child can share in the many incidental learning experiences that hearing children take for granted.

It was pointed out that at one school for the deaf in Tokyo, Japan, parents move into the area when the child is accepted in the school. The parents then work as educational aides at the school. Usually, by the 8th grade the student transfers to the public school and supposedly, 95% graduate from high school. This may be partially due to the fact that Japanese is easier to speech-read than is English.

There was strong feeling expressed that sign language is not now given an adequate chance in grade schools. Quite often, it is only resorted to after all else has failed.

Considerable criticism was voiced with respect to existing curricula in schools for the deaf. "Rarely do we find sequential reading programs present." "The curriculum is often poorly prepared and disorganized." "Many teachers just do their own thing with students." In some cases the "expectancy syndrome" is rather low. "The kids won't make much progress—don't expect too much. With these types of attitudes the feeling is that we are defeated before we start."

It was pointed out that although we talk about things like pro-

grammed learning most instruction still takes place with the teacher standing at a blackboard.

A deaf graduate student stated that "Schools generally emphasize only facts. They do not encourage children to question the status quo nor do they encourage or permit students to express their feelings." Group living stifles expression of personal feeling. Frequently schools fail to help the child accept himself for what he is.

LEARNING TO LEARN

Participants were unanimous in agreeing that motivation is the key to learning. The question of how to develop motivation in deaf children formed the basis of most of the discussion that follows.

It was generally agreed that the amount of enthusiasm exhibited by teachers and other adults is crucial in developing motivation among deaf children. Too often this enthusiasm is sadly lacking.

How do we motivate deaf children to want to learn? Some suggestions were: (1) Make learning exciting; (2) reduce anxiety and make the child feel at home; (3) provide meaningful experiences; (4) give the child more responsibility in deciding personal matters, and (5) stress the child's strengths rather than his weaknesses.

Some participants felt that the sheltered aspects of residential living tend to reduce the child's motivation. They stressed the importance of competing with hearing peers as an incentive for motivation. Others argued that the lack of motivation exhibited by many students is a result of three months' summer vacation when there is little stimulation or challenge.

Clear and easy communication between the deaf child and his teacher was thought to be a critical factor in motivation. It was pointed out that sign language is the "native language" of most deaf children. To deprive the child of this method of expression will usually lead to a lessening of the desire to learn.

Participants felt the inner motivations of the deaf child were crucial elements in the learning process. Two deaf women with masters degrees cited their own experiences to illustrate this point. Another participant noted that in order to learn, a person must first respect himself. It was agreed that we frequently do not do enough in fostering this respect among deaf children.

There was general agreement that learning is not confined to the school setting. The role of parents in out-of-school learning was stressed.

It was agreed that education begins with the parents. There is an urgent need to begin working with parents during the pre-school

years. Opportunities should be provided where these parents can meet deaf adults, attend PTA meetings, etc.

The importance of reading as a tool for learning was emphasized. Again, the importance of parents in promoting reading was noted. Parents were encouraged to label all items in their homes as one way of fostering reading.

Many participants decried the fact that so much valuable time is lost while parents search for that "perfect school" where their child's hearing will be restored and speech will be learned. Deaf participants and parents who had older deaf children emphasized the need to start early in developing language skills.

Strong feelings were expressed concerning the amount of time which schools devote to developing speech. It was strongly advocated that signing be stressed during the early years with emphasis on speech training coming later. It was agreed, however, that signing is not a magic formula in itself. It merely takes much of the guess work out of communication. Deaf children also need a wide variety of experience to stimulate learning.

Participants agreed that learning is a private matter. The teacher can lead a child to material to be learned, but only the child can determine what will happen then. The teacher was compared by one participant as the catalyst for learning. Teachers should get away from merely teaching subject matter and instead should build on the student's interest.

DEVELOPING SENSITIVITY TO ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

The question of communication methodology received considerable attention. Some felt that sign language was the best approach with young deaf children since it was easy to see and reproduce. Others felt that sign language leaves out too many words and that perhaps signed English would be better. Still others felt that we should use only fingerspelling. There was considerable discussion of presenting Ameslan first, with English being taught later as a second language. One group heatedly debated the merits of having deaf teachers at the pre-school level. Although the issue was not resolved the debate evolved into more of a discussion of the ability of the individual rather than merely whether he were deaf or hearing.

All groups stressed the importance of parent-teacher cooperation in the educational process. Many felt that too often teachers feel that parents have little to contribute.

There was considerable debate over whether there should be a 9 or 12 months school year. Some thought that summers were good

for learning homemaking skills and getting other experiences. Others thought that camp experiences and trips could be used as part of motivation for learning.

One deaf adult suggested that each school board should be composed of deaf alumni. The feeling was that these people would be more interested and thereby improve the educational program.

Participants discussed the isolation that exists in many residential schools. Many felt that these schools should become more a part of the community. They felt that if secondary level students could be exposed more to the hearing community they would be better prepared to meet after-school problems.

The need for parent education was seen as very important. Related to this is the need to educate physicians. Many parents felt that physicians either did not know much about deafness or were reluctant to tell parents the facts for fear of upsetting them. Someone noted that a new law in Massachusetts requires that literature be sent to all parents within 10 days after the birth of a child explaining the possibility of deafness.

A lively debate occurred over the issue of whether or not the use of signs hurt speech development. One parent pointed out that at home the family uses total communication, but at school the oral method is used. The parent said that this was confusing to the child. Since total communication helped him, he couldn't understand why it was not used in school also.

A number of parents felt that professionals make them feel dependent because most often they only discuss facts and never feelings. The parents said that they need someone to work with them on their feelings about having a deaf child. Too often counseling becomes a "frill" on the educational scene. Too much stress is placed on academic problems. It was suggested that Speech and Hearing Centers might provide more counseling services to parents.

V. Language and Communication

FRANK BOWE

Editor

The following comments were made by the participants in reacting to the topics of incidental learning; linguistic communities, subcultures, or subsocieties; and, the role of parents of deaf children. These comments are often direct statements made by the participants, while others have been paraphrased slightly to permit uniformity of expression.

INTRODUCTION

This session was devoted to a discussion of the following three topics: (1) Language Input and Output; (2) Differentiating Between Communication and Language, and (3) Defining English and Language. Generally, the groups had considerable difficulty in dealing with these topics. The discussion seemed to center primarily around the cognitive rather than the affective aspects of the subject.

LANGUAGE INPUT AND OUTPUT

The participants felt that the need for dedicated teachers who truly love and care for deaf children is tremendously important. When this quality is present in teachers the child will learn more regardless of the method used. Unfortunately, many teachers tend to be too aloof and more interested in experimenting with the child rather than teaching him.

There was general consensus that total communication is the best method for insuring adequate language input and output. A number of recent studies by Meadow and others were cited to support this belief. Young teachers were cautioned, however, about thinking that total communication is a panacea for all of the problems of deaf children.

Participants recommended strongly that educators stop holding to old philosophies and methods and become more flexible. There was strong agreement that if total communication is used the student will select the mode of communication that best fits his particular needs.

The need to accept the deaf person as he is was repeatedly stressed. The point was made that the deaf youngster will never outgrow his deafness and that he can never truly live in a "hearing world." Hearing parents were urged to get to know deaf adults and to learn manual communication.

There was strong consensus that adults need to focus their efforts on the child and not his deafness. Some felt that this can best be done in special classes in the public schools rather than in residential schools.

It was generally agreed that the ideal time for basic language development is from birth to five years of age. One deaf mother urged that during this time we should attempt to stimulate all sensory inputs.

The importance of incidental learning in language development is often overlooked. Participants agreed that parents can be very important in providing this type of learning opportunity.

There was a heated discussion as to how language should first be presented to the deaf child. Some felt that sign language should be introduced as early as possible. Others felt that we needed a more refined system, perhaps signed English. The latter group pointed out that the child will reproduce what he sees. If we want good language then we must present the child with this at all times.

It was agreed that although language input is very important, the deaf child must internalize this language before he can use it expressively. Internalization comes through repeated exposure, experience, interaction and modeling.

Time and again the point was made that we need to be more accepting of the deaf child's language efforts. Being overly critical of the child's expressive language can be devastating. Teachers, especially, were cautioned with respect to this. There was a general feeling that if deaf children are given the opportunity to experiment with language they will eventually correct their mistakes.

Throughout the meeting, groups kept going back to expressing their pleasure and relief that sign language or total communication is now being permitted in more and more schools. It was pointed out, however, that merely permitting sign language in the schools is not enough. We need to teach this language to children. The feeling seemed to be that if proper signing were taught it would lead in time to better English.

DIFFERENTIATING BETWEEN COMMUNICATION AND LANGUAGE

As noted earlier, participants had considerable difficulty differentiating between communication and language. There was a definite lack of agreement upon definitions for the two terms. After some discussion, language was defined as an arbitrary system of accepted symbols that are used by a group. It is a tool used to finish a job. Communication, on the other hand, is a flow of ideas. When two people cannot understand each other, communication has broken down. "Communication is reaching someone with understanding. Language is merely a vehicle of communication."

It was pointed out that it is possible to have communication without language. Sometimes, for the very young child, language actually impedes communication, especially if the parent insists on complete sentences when the child is not yet ready to communicate on that level.

There was general agreement that communication is most often initiated by the child. This should be accepted and built upon.

Some participants tended to think of language and English as being synonymous. A teacher pointed out that language is merely one form of communication and not necessarily English. Various methods of manual communication, such as, signing, fingerspelling, and gestures are also forms of communication.

Participants agreed that there are no "bad" levels of language. Times change and language changes. It was stressed that we should not judge the language of others by our own dialect, whether it be spoken or signed.

There was strong consensus on the need to give greater attention to the affective components of communication. Specifically, there is a need to capitalize on the feeling expressed through manual communication. One participant compared this to the feeling conveyed through voice inflection in spoken language. One discussion ended with the following impassioned plea: "This group has been fussing about methods and not thinking about the deaf kid. I don't think we give a damn about the kid as long as we train him in our way. We have to think about the deaf child's feeling—he is a person!"

DEFINING ENGLISH AND LANGUAGE

The participants had considerable difficulty differentiating between the terms language and English. Many people in one group became confused when asked "if a deaf child can have good lan-

guage but poor English?" After much discussion it was finally brought out that this, in fact, can happen.

There was a great deal of Discussion as to whether sign language was really a language. The consensus seemed to be that it was. There were some who erroneously felt that sign language was merely an English dialect and not really a separate language.

It was noted that many deaf children have excellent ideas and knowledge of sign language but lack the English to properly express themselves. The need to help the deaf child develop proper English syntax was seen as highly important.

VI. Incidental Learning, the Community, and the Home

NORMAN TULLY
Editor

The following comments were made by the participants in reacting to the topics of incidental learning; linguistic communities, subcultures, or subsocieties; and, the role of parents of deaf children. These comments are often direct statements made by the participants, while others have been paraphrased slightly to permit uniformity of expression.

THE FACTOR OF INCIDENTAL LEARNING

1. Children are learning all the time. We need to understand what the child is learning and give him the opportunity to explore.
2. The mother should stimulate learning on the part of the child. Since the deaf child does not acquire information the same as a hearing child, parents need to make a conscious effort to bring in picture books and toys to enrich the child's experiences.
3. We need not pay so much attention to the materials available to us, but to the human resources. Our school personnel can make great and positive contributions to our deaf students.
4. A father of a day class student felt that if the family offered the youngster many opportunities for learning that he would not end up in a residential school. However, he also felt that there must be more education for the parents if they are to help the deaf youngster.
5. One deaf adult said, "My learning took place almost totally *outside* the classroom. Since I lost my hearing at the age of 10, I had language. Yet no one in my public school could communicate with me."
6. Another deaf adult lost his hearing at nine and the school used the oral method. He had to learn almost everything from books. "Since I couldn't speech read, not much incidental learning took place. Right now, if I had a chance in a school for the deaf, I would stress that every life compares with a channel that flows

like a river of experience. Every deaf child's life is like a channel."

7. Maybe a part of the problem is that no one reads to deaf children. Perhaps the desire or wish has to precede the actual reading.
8. Sometimes because he does understand what he sees he puts wrong values on the event. This interferes with his learning. Hearing children have many more significant models and aren't always seeking their own identity in a smaller group. Because he frequently lacks repeated experience, the deaf youngster is always wondering who he is.
9. Language development is involved with the development of self-image. Successful communication would lead to a better self-image.
10. "When I could hear, much talk was unimportant. When I became deaf, all talk became important."
11. "First time my daughter used the TTY, she asked what do you talk about on the phone. She had no idea of what small talk would be about if the person was not within sight."
12. It is at home that the child learns such things as: (1) the factors involved in cause and effect, (2) psychological factors, (3) feelings of parents. All of this is done with a minimal amount of effort. The deaf child does not learn as much as the hearing child, unless concentrated bombardment of information is given.
13. "Strange, but frequently boys can have real participation with hearing people when engaged in sports, yet they never really discuss anything regarding the sports."
14. "Before learning can take place, one needs to find and trust a real friend. They are hard to come by."
15. Two students who attended a residential school felt that they missed a lot of out of classroom experience. They wanted to know why they couldn't get the same education as hearing students.

LINGUISTIC COMMUNITIES, SUBCULTURES, OR SUBSOCIETIES

1. Most deaf people seek out their own level. It is not only the linguistic barrier but the whole idea and use of language. Hearing people do not present the opportunity for deaf people to be involved in and a part of the group. There seem to be two sets of people in the world: the people who know signs and the individuals who have no idea about signs.
2. The deaf are people from many subcultures, but they do not themselves constitute a subculture—they are a minority group.

3. A point to ponder is that the deaf are the only handicapped group which congregate. This was presented as evidence that the deaf have a subculture.
4. Deaf people have common abilities and one of the main reasons for them getting together is easy, fluid communication. Deaf people tend to be less discriminatory towards the members within their sub-subgroups.
5. There are all kinds of deaf people and some labels are imposed by linguistic incompetency.
6. The college deaf and the non-college deaf do not usually go around together because of their differences in linguistic abilities.
7. The term "sub" is a misnomer. Many people think of "sub" as meaning below and this is not good. One usually thinks of the sub-culture as being inferior to the larger culture. They are merely differently cultures, each with its own identity.
8. Linguistic community is more accurate because there is a great deal of variety in the deaf community which seems to be bound together only by language.
9. The point was made that many deaf people have long term contact with the same deaf friends. Some start in pre-school and continue through college with the same students. Thus their ties are tighter because of continual contact.

ROLE OF PARENTS OF DEAF CHILDREN

1. Parents must be associated with deaf adults to begin to understand what it is all about. During the contact phase, parents will begin to understand how to deal with their child.
2. Parents depend on professionals for correct advice but they usually get a lot of confusing answers about deafness and the method which the different schools use for communication.
3. Ideally the out-of-school learning should be designed to support the education which the child is receiving in school. One group expressed the feeling that incidental learning plays a great part in the total educational picture of a child's being and that the only answer is school-parent cooperation with the professional personnel of the school leading the way.
4. Many things happen without any planning. Such unstructured occasions can be used as a learning situation because of the interest the children will have in the subject.
5. Deaf parents have an advantage over hearing parents with a deaf child.
6. "Doctors kept telling me that there was nothing wrong with my child—that she was just slow in developing. Next, they told me that she was aphasic and they treated her as aphasic for one

year. Then they gave her a hearing aid. I always spoke to her and she learned to read my lips. The doctor was the last to admit that the youngster was deaf."

7. (Lively discussion) "I do not care how the parents and the child communicate—it's not necessary to use good English. Communication is the important thing. The method does not matter. The English language is not *that* important."
8. Some advice that can help hearing parents: (1) Don't be ashamed of your deaf child; (2) don't overly protect him; (3) take him with you; (4) make ordinary demands; and (5) use words which help him to grow in language comprehension.
9. For a long time two hearing parents thought that their child was homesick. Now they feel that it was a lack of privacy in the residential school—a lack of being able to schedule himself; even as a very young child he was not permitted to close the door to the hall.
10. Many deaf parents of students in this group forced them to communicate with hearing people—it was very frustrating, but through it they learned about *life* because their parents lacked experience.
11. If a student attends day classes, the parent can review things which were learned at school.
12. Parents need to explain things like sex, morals, and so forth.
13. Parents need to give more love and better understanding to their children. And, they need to learn to communicate.
14. Parents seem to be more afraid of giving freedom to deaf girls than to any other teenager.
15. The deaf students in this group don't know why things have stayed the same year after year—they want change!
16. In order for parents to learn to accept their deaf child, they should get in contact with parents of older deaf children.
17. We should give parents the choice of educational programs they want their child to go through.
18. If a family has hearing and deaf children, the parents should attempt to bring all the things up that the hearing children watch or do—all the words and sentences must be brought to the deaf child's eyes.
19. Parent groups often reflect the professional organizations—if the professionals said we need you as parents, we would have a new breed of parents. Parents are usually willing to take the responsibility—they just don't know where to begin or how. You will get as much from parents as you demand.
20. Maybe by having the deaf adults in charge of sign classes for the parents of the deaf—the deaf and hearing would meet half-way.

Both are concerned about the well-being of their deaf children, but neither knows how to approach the other.

21. One parent indicated that at first she did not know that a deaf child could learn incidentally. Now she always has a paper and pencil around. Before she thought that she could not communicate, but now she does through total communication.
22. Parents need to become more knowledgeable about what the school is doing and generally need to show more interest in the school.
23. Parents must communicate with the child and make him part of the family.
24. Educational systems should provide educational coordinators to guide the parents. We need to have this person personally contact the parents.
25. Many basic things must be learned at home before the child goes to school. If the parents work with the child during this period, the child will be ahead.
26. Hearing parents should go to deaf clubs—make different contacts—and see different levels of deaf people in operation.
27. The Chicago Hearing Society: (1) set up a university training program; (2) provides home counseling; (3) conducts small groups with professional leaders; (4) has parents who are trained in the classroom with the child from infancy; (5) has parents meet other parents to share common problems.
28. Acceptance or rejection by parents can be a matter of communicating in many ways.

VII. Educational Objectives, Teacher Training, and Counseling

GLENN LLOYD
Editor

CHANGING OBJECTIVES IN EDUCATION OF THE DEAF

In a philosophic perspective, the objective in education for each deaf child could be considered to have always been to help him "become all he is capable of being." There is no reason to think in lesser terms today. However, while this objective or philosophy does seem appropriate, the facts do not indicate that the goal has been met for too many deaf children over the years. That the average reading level for graduates from education programs for deaf children is somewhere around the fourth or fifth grade level must indicate that the deaf child has not been enabled to become all he is capable of being.

Probably most deaf children in our nation are in some kind of school program. That there are many others not in a program of any kind is a situation which we cannot afford to tolerate. Programs for deaf children very often fail the child because the needs of the individual child are seldom considered. There is an extreme need to provide a highly individualized educational program. New patterns and models such as the open school concept should be investigated and tried out in a continuing effort to determine better, more individualized possibilities.

Individualization in program includes not only subject matter, but approaches in interpersonal communication techniques based on the individual child's best communication mode or modes. We must become obliged to allow the child to dictate the ways in which he and his teachers, peers, and parents will communicate with him. Careful considerate evaluation of each child, then, must include not just psychological and educational achievement evaluations, but preferred or indicated communication modality need as well. We must

plan for and build educational programs around the child and his needs in contrast to the heretofore practice of attempting to fit the child into the educational program which happens to exist.

There are, of course, additional problems becoming more apparent in educational programs for deaf children. The most significant development may be directly related to the recent rubella epidemics which have resulted in live births of children with multiple disabilities. More and more, it seems, deaf children with at least one other limiting condition are entering schools and programs. These children are not simply prelingual deaf emotionally disturbed; prelingual deaf motorically involved; prelingual deaf visually limited; and on and on, children. Innovations in program patterns and services must occur if we are to meet the needs of these multiply handicapped children.

There is an implication here, too, for teacher programs. In addition to the areas discussed previously, there is a definite need to prepare professional personnel who will be able to deal with multiply handicapped children and their educational needs. This, in turn, implies that a broadened program must include personnel with additional competencies. There is a need to prepare teachers for service in such a multiplicity of areas (e.g., preschool, home, elementary, junior high, high school) with additional competencies, it is staggering to the mind to have to consider appropriate preparation programs for teachers of deaf children who have additional handicaps. Nevertheless, the schools must serve all of these children, but they cannot do the job without properly prepared personnel.

TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Teacher preparation for deaf children, over the years, has not been subject to critical evaluation to any significant degree. So long as the program prepared the entering teachers according to the 1954 standards of the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf, the new professional was considered to be adequately prepared. As a result, hundreds of new people entering the profession sought and received temporary certification. Following three years of "successful teaching experience as attested to by an appropriate supervisor," permanent certification by the CEASD was routinely granted. The consequence of this procedure has been that teachers, fully certified, have been, in fact, unprepared in the most basic of all areas—ability to communicate and interact adequately with the children they were "teaching."

One would expect, too, that the teacher of deaf children would have contact with graduates of the school and be able to talk with them as adults. Not so. Most teachers who meet their former pupils

tend to avoid them or exhibit a frustration to such a degree that communication simply cannot take place. This seems to be the result of failure on the part of the teacher to learn manual forms of communication upon which the majority of deaf people depend. The basic fault lies with the teacher education programs which promulgated the notion that all reasonably intelligent deaf children could and would learn to communicate through speechreading and speech processes. The thesis was that any failure to do so lay within the inherent incapability (insufficient intelligence) of the child since the teachers taught speechreading and speech skills throughout the school life years of the child.

Any research which may be cited has consistently shown that the correlation between intelligence and speechreading capability is almost totally insignificant. Attempts to develop proven methodologies for teaching speechreading to prelingually deaf children have not resulted in any meaningful approaches. The question, then, is why are students required to take course work in teaching speechreading to deaf children when nobody knows how to do it? Such a course, however, is currently required for certification purposes.

The whole question of teacher preparation seems to revolve about one central theme: relevance. Are the programs which propose to offer specialized preparation in teaching deaf children relevant to the educational needs of deaf children? Is it not long past due to raise the question of relevance and demand a reevaluation on such a basis?

A major weakness, it would seem, in preparation programs is that there are too many and, partly because of this, those in existence tend to be vastly understaffed. So many programs are "one man shows" that it is hardly possible for students to get more than one viewpoint, which in the majority of cases is the oral philosophy. Students emerge from such cocoon-like programs with almost no concept of the basic issues in the field of education for deaf children. Very often, their first contact with the realities of manual communication processes is after the fact and they are ill prepared to participate in discussions or to consider the pros and cons simply because of the fact of ignorance which resulted from inadequate preparation.

To their credit, some programs are now at least providing the opportunity to investigate and/or discuss the question of "oral only versus oral plus manual philosophies." A few even go so far as to provide the opportunity for students to acquire basic skills in manual communications and fewer still *require* students to acquire such skills as part of their program of preparation.

We know that the purely oral approach is almost totally ineffective with the vast majority of deaf children. The research which

has been done has been unanimous in the finding that those children who were exposed to manual communication at an early age achieve significantly better both academically and socially. It has even been shown, through research, that speech development is not retarded and speechreading may be affected positively. There is absolutely no research evidence which demonstrates the superiority of purely oral approaches over combined approaches for deaf children.

Since the objective data do support the thesis that deaf children do benefit, do achieve better, when combined communication methodologies are used, it seems mandatory that our teacher education programs provide opportunity for, and require all students to have in-depth preparation in the area of meaningful communication techniques for work with deaf people. This is a major area of concern and a major problem.

It is also essential to question the advisability of having so many training programs, especially since many of them seem to exist primarily because of the availability of federal funds for program support. Federal funding is not a justifiable reason for the existence of a program for preparation of teachers for deaf children. Federal funding for support, however, is justifiable but a more appropriate rationale for program support must be considered and established. Under current patterns, it seems that political expediency is a major criterion. The result is the "one man show" in too many instances.

An adequate teacher preparation program must be able to retain a sufficient number of qualified professionals at appropriate levels and a variety of specialized areas of education. There must be a broad based program with course work in the specialty area the direct teaching responsibility of the specialized professional staff. Can audiologists, generally, really teach relevant courses on hearing problems; the nature of the result of prelingual deafness; auditory training methods for deaf children; counseling parents who have a deaf child; home practices for parents, and other allied areas? Can speech pathologists teach courses in the area of the results of deafness on speech and language development, especially prelingual deafness; remedial and developmental speech techniques for prelingually deaf children; counseling of parents with deaf children; home practices for parents with deaf children; and other allied course work? Few audiologists or speech pathologists are prepared to work with or have any realistic experiential background to relate their specialty to the problems of deaf children. Yet, because only one professional in the area of deafness may be in a given program, these are too often the people with major responsibility in these vital areas.

A reasonably designed program must have professionals with

specialized preparation and experience in the educational and social aspects of deafness along with the additional specialized area in which they function in teacher education programs. Without such background, we cannot hope to see better prepared personnel entering the field of education for deaf children than we have had in the past. The one man program must be eliminated. The audiology-speech pathology oriented teacher-training program must also be eliminated.

What alternatives, then, exist? This is as difficult a question to deal with as almost any other problem in our area of concern. Nevertheless, it seems clear that a beginning step should be in the direction of more regionally oriented preparation programs as opposed to the current locally oriented pattern. Reducing the number of federally supported centers could make it possible to centralize properly qualified professional staff and to increase the number of students who could be taken care of. Rather than preparing as few as four new teachers a year with an extremely limited background of professional preparation, as many as twenty to twenty-five, at a minimum, could be expected with a much broader background. Additionally a greater degree of selectivity of faculty would be possible, ensuring the students of a higher quality professional preparation program.

As is true with so many of the regular classroom teachers of deaf children, many of the college or university level instructors, themselves, are unable to communicate with deaf people via manual modes. Such a lack may well lead to a practice of restricted experience with deaf people for students since it would very likely be entirely possible that the program personnel would be unable to initiate a plan for interaction between students and deaf people in the community. An ever recurring demand is that students preparing to become teachers of deaf children have, as part of their program, opportunity to interact with deaf people no longer in school. It seems, then, that the teacher preparation program personnel should have the responsibility to incorporate such experiential opportunities into the program.

All in all, that which is desirable and necessary in teacher preparation programs include those areas which will prepare people as teachers who can realistically attend to the educational needs of deaf children no matter which methodology is current for whatever program the teacher enters into as a teacher. This must mean that the program provides for preparation in at least the three main areas of (1) methodology and planning for effective teaching, (2) socio-cultural, psychological factors, and historical perspectives in the education of deaf children, and (3) skills in communication, including manual forms. Without the ability to communicate, both

expressively and receptively according to needs of each deaf child, the rest becomes mere didactic exercise on a one way road to frustration for the child and the teacher.

PERSONAL COUNSELING IN SCHOOLS

If ever an area were to be considered a "wasteland" in the educational programs for deaf children, the area of counseling and guidance for children in schools would almost certainly have to be given the number one ranking. It is almost impossible to discuss the nature of counseling programs in schools since such programs are virtually nonexistent. That there is an urgent need for such services in the school program cannot be denied. But, the means of remedying such an appalling situation is not just around the corner, nor just around the next corner for that matter.

Typically, in residential programs, the people responsible for the children during the out of class hours are very frequently called dormitory counselors. Or some other similar title may be used to designate their assumed role. Typically, again, the vast majority of the dormitory personnel have never had formal preparation in the area of residential care, supervision, recreation, and social skills, not to mention counseling.

Some schools are making efforts to upgrade the level of dormitory personnel for their schools, but such efforts are spotty. Perhaps one of the most limiting factors in such efforts is the failure on the part of state officials and legislators to recognize the vital role the after-school hours personnel could assume. Because the schools are allowed to pay wages which, at best, are no higher than poverty level, they are forced to accept people who are willing to accept a mere pittance in return for their physical presence in or near a group of deaf children all of the same sex and approximate age.

The dormitory counselor is in a unique position to contribute to the overall social and emotional development of deaf children through counseling and guidance activities. However, even should a dormitory counselor be so inclined, seldom is one able to communicate with the children. And there is certainly very little incentive for one to learn to do so. Life is a lot easier if all one has to do is sit in a comfortable place and watch the children, line them up to march to meals at the appointed hour, see to it they are in bed at the right time, and turn on the lights in the morning when it is time to get up. This way, the counselor doesn't have to worry about what is going on in their minds, only with the proper location of their bodies at the proper times.

There has been discussion for several years over the proper role of the dormitory counselor. Most people in the area of education

for deaf children recognize the need for people who are at least as qualified as the classroom teacher for the even more important responsibility for good, continuing social, emotional, and educational development. We seem to be able to recognize the need. We just haven't been able to do much about meeting it.

VIII. Systems of Education, Teaching Techniques, Innovations, and Student Involvement

GLENN LLOYD
Editor

SYSTEMS OF EDUCATION

Over the years, the system of education for deaf children has been predominately centered about the residential school concept. Some years ago a definite shift toward day programs developed so that, today, more than 50% of all deaf children in educational programs are in day school or day class programs. In addition, more residential schools are encouraging families living within commuting distance to enroll their children as day pupils. This trend is considered by most people to be favorable because of the possible benefits to be derived from living with the family on an everyday basis rather than visiting the family on weekends, or once a month, or even only during major vacation breaks.

Perhaps partly due to the increased emphasis on home living for deaf children in school, more attention is now being given to programs for parents. It should be recognized that education is not limited to nor confined within the classroom. The teacher of deaf children should have a major responsibility in the overall academic development of the child. The tools with which to work, communication, are primarily not learned in the classroom in spite of the claims we make about teaching language to the deaf child in the classroom. For too many years, the myth that a major responsibility of the schools is to teach language has really contributed more to limitation in language and academic development than it has to growth. The parents, the home, the community should be the primary language development environment for deaf children just as it most certainly is for normally hearing children.

Today, we see much more emphasis being given to the concept

that the parents do have or should have a primary responsibility, especially in the development of the basic tool of language. Classes in manual communication, although not a routine service, are becoming more and more available. It may be hoped that by teaching parents to communicate effectively with their children at home, the children will arrive at the school with basic competency in English. It must also be noted that oral communication processes have never been adequate to meet the needs of most deaf children and, therefore, more and more families are learning to sign and fingerspell to their children along with the speech.

Along with the teaching of manual skills, schools are attempting to provide counseling and guidance services to families in order to assist them in attaining true acceptance of the deaf child for the worthwhile being that he is. Without understanding and acceptance, little substantive progress may be anticipated. With understanding, acceptance, and the willingness to learn to communicate with the deaf child it may be anticipated that the deaf child will become a real member of the family circle rather than somebody who happens to eat and sleep in the same house with the family. It should no longer be the rule that the deaf child is a "stranger in a strange land."

Thus, the system of education for deaf children is moving in the direction of total family involvement from the earliest possible moment on through the preschool, elementary, and high school years. With improved linguistic competence, the classroom teachers can concentrate more on the academic portions of education just as is the case for regular school programs for normally hearing children.

TEACHING TECHNIQUES AND METHODS

Methodology continues to be concerned with how the teacher communicates with the deaf child. Methods of teaching, reading, math, science, social studies, and other academic subjects seldom are discussed. This is probably due to the fact that "oral versus manual versus Total Communication versus the Rochester Method versus the Simultaneous Method versus the Combined Method versus Ameslan versus SEE versus Siglish versus LOVE" controversies continue apace. There seems to be almost as much controversy today among the professionals over which manually oriented methodology is best as there has been in the oral versus manual controversy. Objective research data have substantially destroyed the notion that the pure oral approach is inherently good and the right of every deaf child to have an opportunity to succeed with. However, a "multichotomy," if there is such a term, of methods now

exists and seems to be muddying the waters to a far greater extent than the deaf child can afford.

Technology of recent years seems to be having some impact on teaching techniques, communication methodology aside. Never before has such an abundance of hardware in the form of overhead projection equipment, movie projection equipment, film strip and slide projection equipment, television equipment, and auditory training equipment been so readily available. Software such as the materials being supplied by Project LIFE are becoming more and more available. The visually oriented approach with attractive and meaningful format makes it possible for teachers to be more effective. The one drawback, and it seems to be a major one, is that most of the software is intended for use with the younger deaf child. The captioned materials for film and filmstrip viewing tend to be more for entertainment than for educational purposes.

INNOVATIONS IN RECENT YEARS

True innovative programs in education for deaf children tend to be relatively nonexistent. A few programs have experimented to some degree with team teaching, but reports of such efforts have not been distributed to any significant degree. The open school concept is the basic pattern at the Model Secondary School, but again no definitive, useful information is available, apparently.

Schools and programs for deaf children should be encouraged to experiment with innovative approaches. More experimentation in team teaching, individualization of instruction, auto-tutorial programs, non-graded programs, and the open school concept are patterns which should be attempted, evaluated, and reported. There needs to be a means of sharing information and ideas between the schools and teachers far beyond what is available today. There are, basically, only two publications for teachers of deaf children, *The Volta Review* and the *American Annals of the Deaf*. Neither may be considered a journal for teachers, the one because of its restrictive viewpoints and the other because of its apparent shift to an emphasis on research reporting. It does seem that a forum for teachers simply does not exist; this for a group of professionals whose number is in excess of 9,000.

STUDENT REPRESENTATION

There is little to be said in the area of student representation. Other than the recent development of the Junior NAD, the children in residential schools tend to be treated as wards of the school

rather than participants in an educational endeavor. The concept of consumer involvement has not filtered down, apparently, to the younger levels, at least insofar as schools and programs for deaf children are concerned. At best, such measures as might be indicated would be difficult to make operational and, given the present general level of maturity and sophistication of our deaf school population, it would appear to be a near impossibility.

The concept of active student involvement in curricular and other matters of their programs is highly desirable, but until and unless the children are enabled to achieve to the appropriate levels it does not seem it can be very much more than a "pipe dream, pure and simple."

IX. Administrative, Dormitory Living, Committees, and Continuing Education

NORMAN TULLY
Editor

This chapter presents typical statements and concepts that were shared by Forum participants during the small group discussions of the topics of administration, dormitory living, committees, and continuing education.

SCHOOL SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

1. Why are deaf children so closely supervised in residential schools and *not* closely supervised in the day programs?
2. The school serves as a pseudo-parent in a residential school, which places great responsibility on the school. There is a need to be sensitive to the wishes of the parents as well as the students.
3. Students need to have an earlier and an increased exposure to the wide range of behavior possibilities by seeing a variety of adult models. There needs to be realistic attention to the training which is available to them.
4. Students should be given more choice.
5. Deaf schools seldom teach deaf children how to *lead*—they are usually *told* what to do.
6. A basic problem of residential schools is the dormitory system. It should be revamped. The children are too confined by the routine.
7. Many schools have different clubs, government, etc. These are good but too often the principal tries to run all of the activities within the school and dormitory.
8. For many administrators much of their time is spent in activities that involve getting funds, public relations, and so on. The

administrator needs good assistants who can spend time as business managers, principals, curriculum directors, and supervising teachers.

9. Qualities of a good supervising teacher: (1) can get along with people, (2) strong person who can lead; (3) has a positive attitude; (4) will listen.
10. That college training programs offer training specifically for supervising teachers.
11. Principals and superintendents should get into the classroom as much as possible.
12. Sometimes the residential schools become the dumping grounds for children with behavior problems.
13. It was felt that school administrators should offer in-service training to teachers so that they can keep up with trends and further develop their skills. School administrators also need to upgrade their skills.
14. Just as black studies generally are not headed by white people, so deaf programs need deaf administrators. Currently there is only one deaf school superintendent and one deaf assistant superintendent in the U.S. This certainly seems strange.
15. School boards make policy, and therefore there should be representation of deaf people on the school boards. There is also a need for deaf administrators to be involved in the process of deciding and developing programs.
16. One minor aspect of the problem is in finding deaf people who are qualified to fill specific positions. This suggests a need for more deaf people to become involved in self-development to the point where they will be recognized for their capabilities.
17. Many administrators of programs for the deaf do not know about deaf people. Those in charge frequently have training in mental retardation, but know little about the deaf.

DORMITORY LIVING

1. Residence hall people should be trained to: (1) understand the problems and needs of deaf children; (2) understand the mother or father figure role which they serve; (3) need to be able to communicate.
2. In one place they found that a young married couple did not work out well while an older couple did a fine job.
3. The single most important qualification for a dormitory supervisor is love of the children.
4. The pay of dormitory people should be equal to that of teachers.
5. Perhaps the training of dorm people should be even better than that of teachers. They should receive instruction in: psychology,

- child development, communication, interpersonal relations, and recreational activities.
6. Have dorm supervisors serve as teacher aides in the classroom. Maybe have two shifts of dorm people. One for day work (and helping the teacher) and the other for the night.
 7. Deaf student: "Dorm counselors never talk to the kids. They stay in their rooms; if we knock we often get no answer. There are some counselors like this who have been employed a very long time."
 8. Deaf student: "Deaf students seem to be more restrained when the counselor is a hearing person."
 9. There is a need for increased pay and status for dormitory supervisors.
 10. Often, hearing supervisors who are not skilled in manual communication become upset with conditions and leave.
 11. A school superintendent explained the hardship which the 40 hour rule has placed on the management of residential living. In one state, the houseparent's salaries are set by state civil service. Kansas pays \$325.00 per month. Oregon pays about the same as for teachers. Most places require the houseparents to have a high school education and some require two years of college training.
 12. Houseparents should know what goes on in the school. They should also know something about behavior modification, child psychology and counseling with children. Perhaps not at the same level as the teachers, but they should have appropriate information to serve the children.
 13. Clergyman: "All people who care for handicapped children should be evaluated—maybe not a psychological exam, but something similar—before giving them employment."
 14. Some national group should establish guidelines, such as: (1) number of children per supervisor; (2) salary schedule; (3) competency statements. (Lots of agreement within the group on this suggestion.)
 15. How is homosexuality encouraged by the undesirable aspects of residential living? Maybe we should make better use of the opportunity to provide for good heterosexual development by developing new living area rules and reconsidering some of the social aspects which have been too tight in the past. (A School Administrator said that this aspect had changed for the better in the last 5 years.) A teacher said that things were not better in her state school because the school administrator seemed to ignore the problem.
 16. Deaf man: "Dorm life prepares a boy to bowl, drink, and go to

church, and when he graduates, that's often about all he knows anything about."

17. A young deaf man: "Maybe HEW should buy a TV station for the exclusive purpose of presenting entertaining and educational programs for the deaf."
18. The image of the dorm counselor must be changed. They should have at least a B.A. Should be viewed as "counselors" who can help kids with their everyday problems.
19. Empathy and love for children are the two main ingredients for successful counseling.
20. The dorm situation usually takes its characteristics from one person—the Dean of Students. This is unfortunate. It would be better to structure it so that it represents the total of the thinking of the teachers, administrator, and dorm personnel.
21. Most of the people in one group were for the continuation of residential schools for the deaf. The consensus was that there is a need for a full training program for dormitory people; perhaps their training is more important than for teachers at this time.
22. Deaf student: "The big problem is that the counselors come for only a year or so and leave. The only conversation they learn is: Time, now 8:00, Time, eat 12:00, etc. They never hold a long and interesting conversation with students—Never!"
23. Graduate of a residential school: "They used us to maintain the rooms, clean the doorknobs, etc. We felt like chambermaids."
24. "We are seeing more and more black students at our school. We need to train and employ more personnel for them to identify with."
25. Administrators and teachers need to change their often negative feelings towards dorm personnel. In the past they have looked at them with something less than respect.
26. Perhaps a good psychologist working with the dean could provide excellent leadership for the dorm counselors.
27. One group thought that a well established cottage system could be more effective than a big dorm.
28. "It is important that boys and girls share mutual facilities and programs. They should have a shared living room, dining room, snack bar, study hall, etc. Maybe even have men supervisors in the girl's dorms and women in the boy's dorms. Couples could be an excellent example for the kids."

FACULTY AND STUDENT COMMITTEES

1. In day schools if they tried reverse integration it might work better. Should teach the hearing sign language so that they can communicate with the deaf.

2. If the students are involved and asked about the regulations it lessens disciplinary problems.
3. Rule-making and the organization of clubs and intramurals would be important considerations for a Student Council. This would give the students the opportunity to exercise responsibility and self government. A Student Court would be another good idea. Through these devices a school could establish a pattern letting the student know that if you break a rule, a disciplinary measure will be taken.
4. "My school uses students as assistant deans. It seems to work fairly well and the students have good support."

CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

1. A tendency with continuing education is that it starts off strong, but soon fades away when the interest wanes. Courses should be of interest to the students—not just a continuation of school subjects.
2. Short courses (4 to 6 weeks) seem more successful.
3. The use of a questionnaire to determine what courses should be offered is seldom valid since people will answer in keeping with how they think you want them to answer.
4. We need to strengthen the parent and deaf organizations so that they will energetically support programs for the deaf.
5. One graduate student said he had questioned many deaf people about what they wanted from continuing education. He found that generally they don't want academic lessons. They want practical things.
6. In Wisconsin they offered an adult education program for deaf people—no one was interested in taking the courses.
7. Faculty person: "Seems that many deaf have good jobs, if the jobs remain at a good level will there be a motivation for deaf people to seek continuing education?"
8. Deaf adult: "Jobs have not been that satisfactory. They want promotions, and continuing education could provide the additional training so that they could get them. Continuing education can encourage and motivate."
9. An Assistant Superintendent: "An Adult Education program which was established at SFVSC seemed to be very strong at first, but has dropped off. For example, in 1965—many people seemed to be interested in electronics (40 to 50 said they wanted courses). The first night 20 people showed up and only 4 or 5 graduated.
10. At Georgia State, the extension department found that at first

they had a very good response from the deaf, but now (one year later) it has declined to only a very few.

11. A teacher: "Maybe we turn people off because we teach the adult programs like we teach children. Maybe we also overlook the family and job obligations."
12. One deaf clergyman said that "his friends thought him odd when he paid to take a summer course—just for the fun of it."

X. Communication Methods

GLENN T. LLOYD
Editor

Discussion over communication methodology tends to revolve about the question of which system incorporating manual forms is better. Basically, today the controversy is not oralism versus manualism, but which system incorporating manual modes is best. There can be no question but that how the child attempts to communicate his thoughts, feelings, wants, etc., must be considered acceptable. However, "what goes in, to a great extent, determines, what comes out." Therefore, we, as parents and professionals working with deaf children, must resolve the question of mode of input for the deaf child.

Generally, the speech input, normal for hearing children, is simply inadequate to any meaningful degree for most deaf children. It becomes almost mandatory for us to make the child's language environment as nearly 100 per cent visually meaningful as is possible. Thus, systems such as Cued Speech, Rochester Method, Combined Method, Visible English, Ameslan, the Simultaneous Method, and Total Communication (which many people believe is simply an expanded or updated term for the Simultaneous Method) must be considered and evaluated against the background of potential efficacy for the deaf child's educational, social, and vocational development.

The three areas which seem to be discussed to a significant degree are Ameslan, Auditory Training, and Cued Speech with only "inpassing" commentary on others.

Ameslan

Ameslan, while lacking a formal definition in this report, is often felt to be a natural language for deaf people. Many proponents for recognition of Ameslan as a legitimate communication mode take the position that it should be learned by the people in the child's environment and used with the child who will then

acquire the language naturally. Later on, then, the deaf child may be introduced to the more formal English in school. The teacher, under this approach, could be expected to use signed English first and then use Ameslan if not understood. It is further felt, oftentimes, that concept development would be enhanced in an Ameslan environment.

A major problem, which tends to be highlighted, is that hearing people who are taught manual forms, are usually taught sign language as hearing people want the deaf to use it. Since this is not the way the deaf communicate, the hearing learner should be taught according to Ameslan. After skill in Ameslan has been acquired, the hearing person can then convert his use to English while retaining the ability to communicate in Ameslan as becomes necessary. That is, unless such an approach is used, the average hearing person will continue to be unable to communicate with the average deaf person.

While much sentiment does exist for the proposal that Ameslan should be the primary language form input for the deaf child initially, the question which must be asked is whether such an approach is, in fact, efficacious. Part of the problem is that we do not have data yet to demonstrate that Ameslan does successfully precede signed English.

AUDITORY TRAINING

There can be little doubt that a sound auditory training program can be beneficial to many deaf children. Whether the deaf child will be able to acquire speech and language in much the same manner as hard of hearing or normally hearing children do, however, is an area which raises more questions than it provides answers. It is possible that a child with native ability to speechread will benefit significantly more than a child who does not possess the native ability. At best, for many deaf children, awareness to environmental sound may be all that could be expected.

Teachers must be concerned with whether the child is deriving any linguistic advantage from auditory input. If not, can the extraordinary amount of time spent in attempting to develop whatever remnants of hearing are present be justified? Are educators emphasizing the wrong sense modality? As it is, to the detriment of many of the children, many teachers tend to become emotionally involved and oftentimes ignore kids who do not respond well in an oral manner.

CUED SPEECH

Many people seem to have heard about Cued Speech, but relatively few have had actual experience with it. Oftentimes, it is the

younger deaf population who have had first hand experience and, in nearly every instance, the tendency was to recognize that while it may be somewhat helpful in the speechreading process, it is of relatively little value in learning speech production. Not all deaf people having had experience with Cued Speech find it helpful, even for speechreading purposes. Amongst people who have discussed this methodology, the primary reaction seems to be one of extreme skepticism.

COMMUNICATION METHODOLOGY SUMMARY

Perhaps the most cogent point that could be made is that it really doesn't matter what you use so long as the deaf child gets a straight English input. While this may be an acceptable point of view for most people, there is serious question as to which input system should be utilized. As is true throughout the history of methodological controversy for education of deaf children, no clear vote of confidence based on any objective data is evident. Thus, whenever the merits of Ameslan, SEE, LOVE, Siglish are bruited about whatever consensus there may be seems to center on Ameslan. Unfortunately, all points of view continue to be stated purely from a personal and/or emotional point of view.

Clearly evident is the fact that the oral versus manual controversy is, at the very least, in its dying throes. The debate today is over which of the manually oriented approaches is superior. Near unanimity must be claimed for the needed inclusion of auditory training and speech regardless of which other input(s) may be indicated.

Unfortunately, few definitive descriptions of any of the methodologies is available for inclusion here. It must be underscored that definitions are lacking for the most part and, as a result, careful, comprehensive, accepted definitions should be formulated and disseminated.

Finally, it appears to be a major critical point that objective data are badly needed. The pursuit of the "Holy Grail" of the perfect system of communication methodology would appear to be doomed to failure, at least when approached on a subjective basis. There may be no perfect system, but there may be one or several superior approaches. The only way to identify the practical possibilities is through careful research procedures so that it no longer remains a question of explaining English to deaf children, but rather the provision of proven means whereby the deaf child can experience English and, as a consequence, master English.

XI. Sex Education, Drugs, Religious Education, and Higher Education

FRANK BOWE
Editor

Discussion of topics scheduled for this session was curtailed by a shortage of time and by the general exhaustion of the participants from the stress of the three days of discussion. Although a number of topics were suggested on the program, only four received any consideration from the groups: sex education, religious education, drugs, and higher education. Despite limitations, the group members became involved in each of these topics and contributed their often deeply-felt views.

SEX EDUCATION

Participants in the various groups identified a definite need for sex education programs in the schools for the deaf. They noted that laws affecting sex education varied from state to state, with some states requiring parental consent before classes may begin.

It was noted that some parents are reluctant to allow the school to assume what they regard as their prerogative as parents. Yet many, perhaps most, group members stressed the responsibility of the school to offer some kind of guidance in matters relating to sex and morality.

Suggestions regarding the actual mechanics of a sex education program were diverse. One suggestion was to use the Illinois School for the Deaf curriculum as a guide. The regular classroom teacher could incorporate sex education into her lessons.

Other discussants felt that the children might be hesitant about discussing this topic with their teachers, and recommended bringing in outsiders who are both knowledgeable in the subject, preferably from personal as well as professional experience, and able to relate to the students. Medical students were suggested in this connection.

Other approaches could involve role-playing, informal discussions in the dorms, and a film series. Several groups stressed the need of students for personal counseling in addition, or perhaps in place of, didactic instruction. Parents should be actively involved in any sex education program, regardless of its nature.

The participants felt that what Gallaudet and NTID are doing is excellent, but relatively late. An adequate sex education program must have its inception in the primary grades and continue forward.

Finally, the group members emphasized the need for affective content in sex education programs. Such courses should attempt to instill a sense of responsibility and an understanding of values. Perhaps the most important aspect of the "sex-educated" student would be the ability to make intelligent decisions based upon adequate and accurate knowledge. Such decision-making ability cannot be taught, but discussants felt that a strong counseling program would be beneficial.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Group discussions on the issue of religious education were often lively and at times even heated.

Some participants felt strongly that religious education has no place in the schools. They tended to feel that this is a matter among the students, parents and their pastors; school personnel should not become involved.

Others expressed their support of religious education as opposed to denominational instruction. These discussants believed that such training should be given on a voluntary basis. Attendance at church services should not be forced on the students. Particularly passionate support for this proposal came from many deaf youth and adults.

A number of the deaf participants stated they had great difficulty reading the Bible. They called for appropriate, up-to-date materials for general religious training. They also indicated a need for clergy sensitive to the needs of the deaf community.

DRUGS

Participants in the various groups agreed that drugs are present in many schools, but disagreed as to the extent or seriousness of the problem. Some group members believed that the lack of effective communication between "pushers" and deaf students limits drug usage by deaf youth. Others suggested that deaf youth often lag behind current trends (for example, in hair length), and that the

drug problem may be expected to get worse for them before it gets better.

Much discussion concerned ways to solve the problem. Some participants indicated that intensive drug education programs, such as those now being developed by the New England Media Center for the Deaf, should be utilized. It was felt that such programs, which might involve films, panel discussions, and printed materials, should not be of a "preaching" nature, but should present the harmful side-effects of drugs in a realistic manner.

Other group members felt that drug education tends to whet the students appetites, making them want to try it. Some participants reported that many deaf youth want to be "in on what's happening." Many of the group members holding this opinion felt that peer pressure would be much more effective than administration-planned programs. The question was posed: "But how do you get this peer pressure?"

A number of groups agreed that expelling the drug offender without first trying to counsel him would not be a satisfactory means of dealing with the situation. A feeling was expressed that the schools should have a policy on this matter prior to the occurrence of incidents. It was noted that Gallaudet has recently drafted such a policy.

It was felt by many discussants that one potential means of coping with the drug problem lies with school counselors. Counseling on the dangers of drug abuse should be part of a total program designed to develop better self-concepts and greater capacity for individual thinking among students in schools for the deaf.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Participants noted with approval the recent growth of post-secondary educational opportunities for deaf youth and adults. They identified a trend toward programs which involve deaf and hearing students together in the classroom, with an interpreter facilitating participation of the deaf students.

Group members suggested four major problems in the area of higher education for deaf students. The first such problem relates to the great range of possible schools and programs from which the student is expected to make an intelligent choice. The schools must provide guidance and counseling which will help the student with his choice. It was felt that this kind of assistance is conspicuously absent in many schools for the deaf.

Another area of need is for information on the various programs to be collated and verified. What little information now exists on these programs is often biased propaganda for the sponsoring

school. Students and counselors alike need objective data from which to make decisions about the various programs. This material should be of a reading level compatible with that of the target group of students.

A third problem concerns the programs themselves. As one counselor put it: "Higher education for deaf students is suffering from growing pains." Group members believed that care must be taken to assure that the offerings are not spread too thin, in order to maintain quality. According to one participant, there are now 38 programs available to deaf students at the post-secondary level. He noted that it is a matter of coordinating these programs so that a sufficient number of sufficiently varied offerings is developed and maintained.

Finally, several groups noted the need for financial aid on both the undergraduate and graduate levels for qualified deaf students.

XII. Jr. NAD Rap-In

FRANK BOWE
Editor

The Junior NAD "Rap-In" was one of the highlights of the Fifth National Forum. Held on an evening in the main convention hall, it attracted a large gathering of interested participants who provided the Jr. NAD panelists with a wide range of probing questions.

Presiding over the panel was John Levesque, former president of the Gallaudet College Student Body Government. Mr. Levesque began the "Rap-In" with some prepared questions, then opened the meeting to questions from the floor.

One of the first questions concerned gripes. What were some of the biggest complaints the students had about their school years? All seven panelists agreed that dormitory life was too restrictive. They actively resented the many rules and regulations governing what they could and could not do during after-school hours.

Other complaints concerned communication. The panelists felt a great need for better communication between students and faculty. It was suggested that faculty and staff members become proficient in the language of signs. Another aspect of the communication gap concerned the need for more bull sessions involving students and staff. Communication between students and faculty was felt to be too highly structured and largely limited to the classrooms and other organized activities.

There was some complaint about the amount of time they were required to spend in speech lessons. The panelists also resented the way many of the school personnel evaluated them on the basis of their speech and speechreading abilities. They felt unfairly evaluated also on their language competence.

Several panelists suggested that school personnel might better approach students on the basis of their human beings rather than as speaking-speechreading-linguaging machines.

One particularly acute need they felt was for counselors able to communicate. They wanted someone with whom they could dis-

cuss their problems—a "parent" for the nine months they spend in the residential school.

Another line of questioning concerned their complaints about family life. Perhaps surprisingly, they had none. All expressed satisfaction with the upbringing they had received. Several went well beyond "satisfaction" and praised the love and communication abilities of their parents.

In marked contrast to their feelings about most residential schools, one student's comments about the Model Secondary School for the Deaf were decidedly positive. This student felt that she had freedom to choose her curriculum, freedom to arrange her after-school hours without too many restrictions, and freedom to communicate as she wished.

Other questions concerned the Jr. NAD itself. The panelists felt that it served a valuable function as part of the total school program. They explained how the newly created Collegiate National Association of the Deaf (CNAD) provided a link between the Jr. NAD and the parent National Association of the Deaf. Those students who had attended summer camps run by the Jr. NAD regarded them as highlights of their school years. They felt they had received valuable leadership training in these camps and had enjoyed them immensely.

The participation of deaf students was felt by the participants to be an important factor in the resounding success of the Forum. Although these students voiced their views freely during the actual Forum, the editors decided to ask selected students to express their feelings about the Forum three weeks following the meeting. Below are their comments, which will provide the reader with fresh insight concerning how deaf youth view the work that is being done on their behalf:

"I really enjoyed myself at the COSD and I learned a lot . . . I wish you could have more students there (a lot more) because the parents, teachers, etc., were really interested in us."

"COSD is a great wonderful meeting about the deaf."

"I'm so thrilled that I had learned many things from people who talk about how deaf child can learn easier their schoolwork in deaf schools or hearing school (public). . . . I wish, I will say Thank you for letting me in COSD."

"I was rather disappointed with the Forum . . . At the forum I saw too many people blaming mainly schools or parents but I feel it is our job to do something about it not just talking about the problems."

"I was really flabbergasted that so many things exist in our own world . . . I enjoyed enormously sharing the experiences and

ideas with others . . . Too bad that many ambitious students and especially parents all over the nation had to miss such a venture."

"The forum was really great and helped me in some things and I also learned some things which I never heard or bothered to understand."

"I profited greatly from this experience of meeting all kinds of deaf adults and I would recommend that the other students have the same privilege that I had."

"It should be a very primary concern to have students in as many professional meetings such as the PRWAD convention and in parents meetings as the future of the deaf are in their hands and if you make the show, you will be HEARD."

"All in all, despite of unique program and group discussions, I do not know when we do carry out the ideas and remedies to the problems of the deaf."

"My question is 'Are they really concerned about us and others who desperately need help?' . . . Basically I believe parents are the people who can make a big and right move to upgrade the schools for the deaf."

". . . I liked the idea of letting young people from the schools participate in the forum. They could contribute lots of benefits to the forum and vice versa."

Forum Summary

LARRY G. STEWART, Ed.D.
University of Arizona

This Fifth National FORUM of the Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf is now drawing to a close. As editor of the Forum proceedings it is my honor to present a summary of this highly stimulating meeting. A summary of a meeting such as this one might include an overview of why we came to the Forum, what we did during the Forum, and what will happen as a result of our shared experiences during the past four days.

WHY WE CAME

More than 500 people have registered for this Forum. As Reverend Desmarais noted in his invocation, we came from far and near. We have among us parents, professionals, and deaf adults and youths from California to Maine, from Canada to Florida.

The main purposes of the Forum were:

1. To raise questions about the education of the deaf;
2. To stimulate new developments in the education of the deaf;
3. To consider the tomorrow of education of the deaf against the backdrop of yesterdays experiences;
4. To provide and receive information;
5. To develop a greater sensitivity to all aspects of education of the deaf.

Taken together, these objectives are consonant with the Forum theme, "Perspectives in Education of the Deaf."

WHAT WE DID

From what I have observed, these past four days have served to give fulfillment to the goals of this Fifth National COSD Forum.

We have gathered here side by side—parent, deaf adult, deaf youth, professional worker, interpreter—and shared our hopes, our frustrations, our failures, our successes, and our dreams. We have spoken of the past, the present, and the future of education of deaf children and youth. We have been blessed in this Forum, for we have listened as well as spoken.

For some of us the chains of ignorance and prejudices have been severed. For others of us these chains have been loosened and we can now open our minds to the real needs of deaf children and think less of our own needs.

The small group meetings were truly outstanding in that the participants attended faithfully, gave their full attention to others, and voiced their views in an open and reasonable way. There was indeed open communication, and such communication is the beginning of understanding. The dedication of the group facilitators, interpreters, and recorders made this easy communication possible.

Permit me to mention several highlights of this Forum:

1. The efficiency and effectiveness of the personable Forum Chairman, Mervin Garretson, and the dynamic COSD Executive Director, Edward C. Carney. The success of the Forum can be attributed in large measure to these men and their assistants.

2. Dr. Albert Ross' talk and the magnificent (I can think of no better word) interpreting of Lou Fant. Dr. Ross helped us to become more fully aware of what some of us could only sense—that we must love and respect deaf children as well as ourselves before we can help them. Perhaps this message from Dr. Ross can be partly interpreted in the words of Frederick S. Perls:

I do my thing,
and you do your thing.
I am not in this world
to live up to your expectations
And you are not in this world
to live up to mine.
You are you
and I am I
and if by chance
we find each other,
it's beautiful.

3. The Junior NAD Rap-In, which gave young deaf people a chance to tell it like it is.

4. The many parents in attendance giving evidence of their love for their deaf children.

5. The Information Exhibits.

6. The wonderful communication skills of George Johnston, which were shared with some of us in an impromptu meeting.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN

As Forum Chairman Garretson pointed out in his introductory remarks, "implicit in the concept of this Forum is a dialogue free from the need to endorse or to recommend. We do not seek consensus but sensitivity." In keeping with this statement, this Fifth National Forum has not come up with any recommendations that organizations can use for action programs in the education of the deaf. Rather, the full impact of the Forum will be evidenced in the minds and hearts of the people who have shared in the events these last four days.

I believe it is safe to say that most of us will leave Memphis with a greater understanding of ourselves as well as of others. We will return home with a greater awareness that our love for ourselves, for parents, for teachers, and for deaf children will enable us to work together to make a better tomorrow for deaf people. The information we have shared will help us to meet the many needs that exist in the education of deaf children. Let's all do our part.

Appendix A

PLANNING COMMITTEE 1972 FORUM

Mervin D. Garretson, Chairman
Principal
Model Secondary School for the Deaf
Gallaudet College
Eleventh and Florida Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

Edward C. Carney
Dr. Leo Connor
Dr. David M. Denton
Miss Josephine Diagonale
Dr. Warren E. Heiss
Mrs. Lee Katz
Dr. Harriet G. Kopp
Dr. Sheila Lowenbraun
Dr. William J. McClure
John Melcher
Lawrence Mothersell
Ramon Rodriguez
Dr. Philip J. Schmitt
Dr. John Schuchman
Mrs. Betty Spellman
Dr. William M. Usdane
Dr. Boyce R. Williams
Dr. Ben E. Hoffmeyer

Appendix B

Facilitators

Dr. Jerry B. Crittendon
Dr. Gilbert L. Delgado
Dr. David M. Denton
Willis A. Ethridge
Mrs. Marilyn Galloway
Mrs. Carol Garretson
Dr. Gerilee Gustason
Dr. Doin E. Hicks
Roy Holcomb
Dr. Richard K. Johnson
Robert R. Lauritsen
Sister Nora Letourneau
Winfield McChord, Jr.
Dr. William J. McClure
Paul C. Peterson
Dr. Howard M. Quigley
Ramon Rodriguez
Frederick C. Schreiber
Dr. John S. Schuchman
Dr. F. Eugene Thomure
Dr. Boyce R. Williams

Interpreters

Dr. Elizabeth Benson
Mrs. Richard K. Boyd
Miss Jackie Bright
Mrs. Lil Browning
Joe L. Buckner
Mrs. Agnes Foret
Richard Gays
Mrs. Joyce Groode
Mrs. Lee Katz
Rev. Marshall Roy Larriviere
Lawrence Mothersell
Mrs. Kay Munro
Miss Elizabeth O'Brien
Mrs. Betty Pellegrino
Dr. Stanley D. Roth
Miss Polly Shahan
James Stangerone
Mrs. Robert Steed
Miss Norma Westfall
Joseph F. Youngs, Jr.

Recorders

Mrs. Carol Boggs
Kenneth Bosch
Jack Brady
Dr. Donald Brown
Miss Charlotte Coffield
Gary A. Curtis
Robert T. Dawson
Miss Josephine C. Diagonale
Dr. W. Lloyd Graunke

Claude Gulbranson
Francis Gyle
Clifford A. Lawrence
High Prickett
Joseph J. Sgro
Dr. David A. Spidal
Richard Steffan
Dr. Roy M. Steele
Mrs. Vivian M. Stevenson
Dr. Armin G. Turechek
David R. Updegraff
Mrs. Janice Zatzman